RELIGION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

WILLIAM CHAUNCEY EMHARDT

RELIGION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

RELIGION IN SOVIET RUSSIA

Anarchy

BY

WILLIAM CHAUNCEY EMHARDT

Field Director Foreign-Born Americans Division and Secretary of Ecclesiastical Relations of the National Council of the Episcopal Church

Together With An Essay On the Living Church

BY

SERGIUS TROITSKY

Master of Theology, Kief.

With An Introduction By

CLARENCE A. MANNING, PH.D.,

Head of Slavic Division of Columbia University

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS.

A. R. MOWBRAY & CO.

LONDON

274.7
Russia - Church History.

COPYRIGHT BY
MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
1929

TO

JOHN WILSON WOOD, D.C.L.,

EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MISSIONS
OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH
IN GRATEFUL APPRECIATION
OF
VALUED FRIENDSHIP OF MORE THAN THIRTY YEARS,
AND AS A
HUMBLE EFFORT TO TESTIFY
TO THE
INDEBTEDNESS OF THE CHRISTIAN WORLD
FOR HIS
WISE AND SELF-SACRIFICING LEADERSHIP
IN THE MISSION FIELD
BY A MEMBER OF HIS STAFF

472

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/religioninsoviet0000will

PREFACE

THIS volume is the outgrowth of a promise made in Paris last summer to prepare the articles by Professor Troitsky printed herewith for publication in America. It is prepared in great haste, the results of which are apparent, because of pressing need of its publication.

The original draft was a running narrative of the Church in Russia since 1917. The author was convinced by interested friends that the immediate need was not a literary production, but a compilation of documentary evidence of the weakness of the claims of the "Living Church," and its successor, the so-called Synodical Church. Certain repetitions, especially those which duplicate Professor Troitsky's citations, are consciously made upon the advice of the same friends. A story of the Church in Soviet Russia, as first planned, has been made unnecessary by the publication last autumn of *The Russian Church Since the Revolution,* by G. P. Fedotoff.

In presenting to the English-speaking public this translation of the remarkable study of the "Living Church" by Professor Troitsky, the writer became conscious of the difficulties which confront one who has not the background of a more intimate acquaintance with Russian affairs since 1917. The original pamphlet was in Russian, and written chiefly for Russophone readers, who were fully conversant with the details of events out of which the "Living Church" grew. That the English-speaking readers might gain a better perspective, what was meant to be an introduction has grown into a book. The "source method" has been followed throughout. Most of the quotations are made from pro-Soviet sources. The

author becomes merely a collator, adding only such interpretations as clarity seemed to demand.

The translation of Professor Troitsky's articles was made in Paris by associates of the Russian Theological Seminary, and placed in the hands of the author of this volume to edit and revise without restrictions. It has been carefully revised by Mr. Alexis Wiren of the Young Men's Christian Association.

The substance of the book is the result of the author's personal study of the growth and development of religious movements in Russia during the past decade, especially the study of translations from *Isvestia* and other official and semi-official journals of the Soviet. Russian friends have offered translation of various documents. It has seemed best, however, when possible, largely to confine translations, quotations, and summaries to two authors who write from another angle: Matthew Spinka, Ph.D., of the Chicago Theological Seminary, and Julius F. Hecker, Professor of Social Ethics in the Moscow Theological Academy. Dr. Spinka has made a careful study of the documents relating to the changes in the Russian Church situation. His bias is evidently slightly against the Orthodox Church; and he seems blind to the many evils of the persecutions. His quotations, however, are accurately given, and compare favorably with those obtained by the author from Russian sources, and are comprehensive and impartial; although his deductions do not seem logically to follow the passages quoted. His conclusions concerning the Sobor of 1923 are largely condemnatory of the gathering and against its legality.

Dr. Hecker is an open advocate of the Soviet Government and its religious program, and is militant against the things that pertain to the Orthodox Church as such. Documentary evidence used by such sources is therefore quoted as given to avoid the appearance of prejudice.

It has been necessary to refer to the Church in America, because the reference by Professor Troitsky is open to misin-

terpretation. The courts in the State of New York did not pass upon the legality of the "Living Church" but merely upon the claim of an appointee of the Holy Synod resulting from the Sobor of 1923 as Archbishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands. At the time of the trial, evidence disproving the legality of the Sobor was not at hand. Such evidence has been introduced in subsequent trials in other commonwealths in which the legality of the Sobor has been denied by the Court.

The author desires to express his deep indebtedness to George Zabriskie, Esq., of New York, for his labour in reviewing the rough manuscript and for valuable suggestions; to Prince Serge Obolensky for invaluable coöperation; to Clarence A. Manning, Ph.D., to Mr. Alexis Wiren, of the Young Men's Christian Association, to Mr. M. J. Petchkovsky, to the Rev. Thomas Burgess, D.D., and to Prince Serge Gagarin, for valuable suggestions; and especially to his associate, the Rev. Robert F. Lau, D.D., for invaluable assistance in preparing the manuscript for the press. To Matthew Spinka, Ph.D., he owes a special debt of gratitude for his generous permission to draw upon the fruits of his research and labour to the extent manifest in the following pages.

CONTENTS

BOOK I

PAGES

INTRODUCTION xiii
CHRONOLOGY xvii

PART I. THE CHURCH UNDER THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT
I. The Sobor of 1917 3
II. Patriarch Tikhon 12

PART II. PATRIARCHATE AND SOVIET
I. Separation of Church and State 19
II. Program of Godlessness 29
III. Despoiling the Church 43

PART III. PSEUDO-SOBOR, 1923
I. Pre-Sobor Machinations 59
II. Sobor of 1923 89
III. The Sobor Illegal 98
IV. The Sobor Uncanonical 105
V. The Sobor Never Recognized 110

PART IV. THE RUSSIAN CHURCH SINCE 1923
I. Return of the Patriarch 127
II. Under a Locum Tenens 141
III. Program of Metropolitan Sergius 151

PART V. SOVIET RELIGION ABROAD
I. Religious Propaganda Abroad 165
II. Defying the Christian World 171
III. Trial of Archbishop Cieplak and Mgr. Budkievicz 181

PART VI. INTERFERENCE IN AMERICA
I. Russian Church at the American Bar . . . 195
II. Disqualification of Kedrovsky 221
III. Status of Metropolitan Platon 228
IV. Interference of Karlowitz Synod 241

PART VII. The Russian Church in 1928
I. Religious Forces in 1928 263
II. Intrigue and Aggression in 1928 271
III. Vitality of Religion in 1928 281
IV. Inner Life of the Church in 1928 294

BOOK II

"THE LIVING CHURCH"

By Professor Sergius Troitsky

Preface 301
Chapter I. Its History 304
II. Foreign Policy 333
III. Ideology and Organization 348
IV. Before Tribunal of People's Conscience and Teaching of Orthodox Church 366

INTRODUCTION

SIXTEEN hundred years ago, Christianity was adopted as the official religion of the Roman Empire. As a result of that recognition, certain principles were accepted by the nations of the Christian world. These have varied with the centuries, but there has been developed a substantial agreement as to the rights of religion and government and as to the procedure which should be adopted by nations which desire to belong to the civilized world.

In 1917 took place the overthrow of the Russian Empire and the organization of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the USSR. This new government was based on entirely different principles and chose to adopt an entirely different attitude toward many of the fundamentals of life. It replaced faith and agnosticism with a definite atheistic theory and declared religion the opium of the people. It embarked on a definite campaign of hostility against the Orthodox Church of Russia and other religious bodies. It introduced a new moral code, a new system of procedure often selected for its contrast to the old order. It inculcated new ideals, and had its own ideology.

Since the attack of Mohammedanism in the seventh century, no such determined assault has been launched on the Christian philosophy of life and principles of civilization. It is therefore not merely unscientific but stupid and dangerous to refuse to understand these principles and to believe that the Christian world is invincible. A generation which has seen the final destruction of Christianity in a part of Asia Minor, where it rose in the first century, and knows what other terri-

tories have swung over to Islam, should be the last to ignore the new menace and the new theories. It is hard to tell which class of persons is the more to be reprehended—those who refuse to believe that anything serious has happened or those who endeavor to explain away disagreeable facts to bring them in line with what we desire to believe, and try to prove that the new organization sympathizes with the old ideals.

The present work is an attempt to present a serious study of the effects of this upheaval on the religious life of Russia and particularly upon the Orthodox Church. Closely connected with the national life, this body was forced to become one of the foremost battlegrounds in the struggle between the old and the new. The result is a surprising story of intrigue and oppression, so strange that we are half inclined to brush it aside as a phantom of the imagination. Yet it has a very serious meaning and is one aspect of the struggle which touches us most closely since it has involved the Orthodox parishes in the United States and Canada and has become a frequent source of controversy in the American courts. It is a tragic story of confusion and of crime—the story of a Church which must reconcile itself to return to the catacombs and face a renewed period of persecution exactly as in the first centuries of our era.

The rise and decline of the Living Church, its schisms and its failures, has never been adequately told in connected form in English. We have heard of it in scattered notes in the papers, but few have grasped the sequence of events or have seen the purpose behind its various manoeuvres. Its relation to the old Church, its use and abuse of political force, its attitude toward the canon law of the Orthodox Church, its treatment of the leaders of the Orthodox Church, and the entanglement of the whole subject with that of revolution and counter-revolution, all reveal the fundamental nature of the struggle that has been going on.

Taking as its basis the decrees of the Soviet Government and the statements of the leaders of the various factions, as

well as of the Orthodox Church, the volume makes clear the tremendous changes which are taking place and contradicts emphatically the dreams of those who believe that, after all, the Soviet Government and its associated movements are desirous of being absorbed in the present system of the Christian world. It opens to us a vista of a new and different life, and if that view does not please us and does not seem attractive, the answer is not to be found in a criticism of the vision, but in a strengthening of the way of life in which we believe and in the formation of a will to preserve something that in spite of all defects is functioning and has functioned to bring order out of chaos and to prepare the world as we know it.

Thus the fate of the Russian Church is not merely a sad tale of disaster. It is a warning, as well. Can the Church in Europe and America so strengthen and reform the present order and the present civilization that it can develop in accordance with the ideals which we all hold? or must it, too, bow to persecution and deprivation as in Russia? Is the new civilization to become predominant, or will the old principles and Faith revive? That is the question which this book should leave with all its readers, and the final answer to that question is in their hands.

Clarence A. Manning.

CHRONOLOGY

Mar.,	1917	First Revolution.
Apr.,		The Most Holy Synod reorganized.
29,		Publication of call for Sobor.
June,		Office of Ober Procurator abolished and Ministry of Confession created.
		Convention of Clergy and Laity held in Moscow.
20,		All aided schools placed under the Ministry of Education.
July 5,		Second announcement of Sobor.
17,		Religious Freedom granted.
Aug. 15,		Opening of Sobor.
Oct. 25,		Fall of Provisional Government.
Oct. 30,		Decision to restore Patriarchate.
Nov. 5,		Tikhon elected Patriarch.
Nov. 21,		Enthronement of Patriarch.
Dec. 4,		All land nationalized.
11,		All schools transferred to Department of Education.
Jan. 19,	1918	Patriarch's Encyclical against nationalization of Church property.
20,		All schools receiving government aid placed under the Ministry of Education.
23,		Law of Separation of Church from State, and School from the Church.
Mar. 5,		Patriarch protested against Brest-Litovsk Treaty.
Apr.,		Recess of Sobor.
June,		Sobor reconvened.
Aug. 15,		Sobor adjourned.
24,		Law forbidding religious instruction in schools.
June,	1921	Beginning of Famine.
Aug.,		Patriarch appeals for aid.
Dec.,		Church authorized to make collection.
Jan. 9,	1922	Sobor of Emigrés at Karlowitz appealed to Genoa Conference.

Feb. 19, 1922	Patriarch authorized selling of all unconsecrated ornaments.
23,	Decrees to remove Church treasures.
28,	Patriarch's letters.
Apr. 22,	Patriarch annuls Karlowitz Synod.
Apr. 27,	Metropolitan Platon appointed temporary administrator of North American Diocese by Patriarch.
Mar. 25,	Letter of Twelve Priests.
Mar. 31,	Execution of Mgr. Budkiewicz.
May 5,	First Number of Journal *Living Church.*
9,	Patriarch arrested.
13,	Demand for Sobor.
20,	Supreme Ecclesiastical Organization.
29,	Living Church adopted its paper program.
June,	Living Church organized.
July 6,	Execution of Metropolitan Benjamin.
Aug. 6,	Living Church Autumn Conference.
Apr. 29, 1923	Sobor.
May 9,	Sobor ends.
June 28,	Patriarch released.
July 15,	Patriarch's Encyclical.
June 10,	Supreme Church Administration renamed Holy Synod.
Sept. 7,	Julius Hecker made Commissioner of Deeds for New York to certify to Power of Attorney to be given John Kedrovsky.
Sept. 29,	Metropolitan Platon transferred from Bishopric of the Diocese of Kherson and Odessa to position of Administrator of North America.
Oct. 8,	Kedrovsky elected Metropolitan.
9,	Kedrovsky consecrated Bishop.
16,	Kedrovsky granted Power of Attorney.
June, 1924	Great Pre-Sobor Conference.
Dec. 24,	Decision of Justice Ford, of Supreme Court of New York.
Jan., 1925	Plenary Assembly of Synod of Living Church.
Feb.,	Metropolitan Benjamin of Leningrad succeeds Evdokim as head of the Living Church.
Apr.,	Death of the Patriarch.
Apr. 20,	Metropolitan Peter appointed *locum tenens.*
30,	Synodal (Living) Church endeavors to unite with Patriarchal Church.

Oct. 1, 1925	Third Sobor (Second of Living Church).
Nov. 25,	Encyclical of Metropolitan Sergius.
Apr., 1926	Plenary Assembly of Synod of Living Church.
Aug. 21,	Russian Bishops in America repudiate Karlowitz Synod.
Jan., 1927	Plenary Assembly of Synod of Living Church.
May,	Registration of Patriarch's Sacred Synod.
July 1,	Ukase of Metropolitan Sergius condemning Counter Revolutionary movements.
July 29,	Metropolitan Sergius released from prison.
June 5, 1928	Patriarchal Sacred Synod—reaffirms appointment of Evlogy and condemnation of Karlowitz Synod.
July 19,	Decree of Court of Appeals of State of New York, reversing decision and instructing new trial.

PART I

The Church Under the Provisional Government

CHAPTER I. The Sobor of 1917

CHAPTER II. Patriarch Tikhon

CHAPTER I

The Sobor of 1917

THE March Revolution of 1917, following the abdication of the Tsar, brought to the Church of Russia new problems of adjustment and adaptation to changed conditions. The change in government was of necessity accepted as a *fait accompli*. Loyal Churchmen looked for some readjustment. A revolutionary group had been working quietly since the failure of the Tsar to convoke a democratic Sobor in 1906.

Early in 1917 a member of the Duma, ex-priest Popov, organized "The All Russian Society of the Democratic Orthodox Clergy and Laymen," of which the priest A. T. Vvedensky was secretary and active agent. This organization showed few signs of growth in any place except Petrograd. The new government, except by a proclamation of religious equality, July 17, 1917, gave practically no attention to ecclesiastical affairs. In June of the same year a minor change was introduced by abolition of the office of procurator of the Most Holy Synod [1] and the appointment of a Ministry of Confessions. In practice this was merely a change of title and personalities. All efforts for further change were held in check in anticipation of a Sobor or Local Council of the Church.

In preparation for this Sobor, a Convention of clergy and laymen was held in Moscow in June, 1917, presided over by the Metropolitan Platon (now of North America). The Con-

[1] Throughout this volume the term "Most Holy Synod" is used to denote the traditional Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church abolished in 1917; "Sacred Synod" to denote the Synod created by the Sobor of 1917-18; and "Holy Synod" to denote the Synod of the Living Church created after the Sobor of 1923.

vention discussed most of the questions likely to be considered. As a result of the Convention, definite principles were advanced as essential to the welfare of the Church. Independence in all matters of administration and legislation was considered of first importance. The hierarchy and Church institutions were to receive legal recognition; and registry of births, marriages, and deaths was to remain a duty of the Orthodox clergy. Church property rights were to be conserved.

This display of vigor in the Church evidently disturbed the Provisional Government. June 20, 1917, a law was passed transferring the schools supported by state funds to the control of the Ministry of Education. This affected about thirty-seven thousand schools which were conducted by the Churches. A more staggering blow to religion was the removal of the Orthodox Catechism from the list of required studies. With this grievance weighing upon them the Church leaders proceeded to the election of delegates to the All-Russian Sobor or Local Council.

The proclamation calling the Sobor was issued April 29, 1917. The reason stated in the call was that the political and social changes following the Revolution required corresponding changes in the Church, which would secure recognition of the possibility and right of free organization. A program committee prepared very full and comprehensive agenda in which Church government, parochial organization, and school control featured largely.

The Sobor was to convene August 15th. On August 11th, the Government granted it the right to work out a new form of Church government, requesting that, when the task was completed, it be submitted to the Ministry of Confessions for approval. In addition, the Provisional Government appropriated one million rubles for the expenses of the Sobor.

On completion of the election it was found that five hundred and sixty-four delegates had been chosen, including ten Metropolitans, seventeen Archbishops, fifty-two bishops, many minor prelates, fifty-four priests, and two hundred and seventy-

eight laymen. The assembly was most representative and democratically chosen. Each of the sixty-six dioceses sent its bishop, two of its priests, and three laymen. In addition the theological colleges, the universities, and the monasteries had their own representatives.

The meeting was opened by a solemn rite especially prepared by the Most Holy Synod for the occasion. The liturgy was sung by Vladimir of Kiev, Benjamin of Petrograd, and Platon of Tiflis (now of North America). There were present Kerensky, the head of the Provisional Government, the Minister of the Interior, and the Minister of Confessions.

Formal discussions began at the second session on the following day. The Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev presided and N. W. Avxentieff, Minister of Confessions, made a formal pronouncement. He welcomed the opportunity to wish Godspeed to the Orthodox Church on this united effort to develop its own organization. Upon the formal approval of the Ministry given to the new organization to be developed by the Sobor, he was prepared to remove from the jurisdiction of the ministry all prerogatives which formerly resided in the ober-procurator of the Most Holy Synod, reserving to the Provisional Government only the right to give general oversight to the legal questions arising under the new system. In other words, he expected to see the Church go forth from the Sobor as an autonomous body.

The Sobor organized with two houses, an episcopal chamber with special prerogatives, including the right of veto, and a clerical-lay chamber.

The aspect of the Sobor was conspicuously conservative. The Metropolitan Anthony of Kharkof (afterwards of Kiev and now head of the Karlowitz Synod) was its leader. The dominant purpose of this party was the restoration of the Patriarchate, abolished two hundred years before. Two other parties were conspicuous, a center party led by Prince Trubetskoy and Father Bulgakof, which was almost in substantial agreement with the Conservatives on major questions, includ-

ing the Patriarchate; and a radical party with but a small and negligible following.

The school question was given immediate consideration. A protest was made to the Provisional Government against the law of June 20th. The Government, however, refused to reverse its decision.

Early in September, a proposal to revive the Patriarchate was formally introduced. September 11th, Bishop Methodius presented the report of a special committee recommending its restoration. Discussion of this report continued until the October Revolution. Arguments were based upon the great need of a leader strong in person and office to uphold the position of the Church as an autonomous body under a government which had recognized the equal rights of all religious groups.

October 28th, while the guns of the Red Army were thundering around the Kremlin, where the Sobor was meeting, the Metropolitan Tikhon of Moscow, who was presiding, called for an end of discussion and immediate election of a Patriarch. Debates did continue until October 30th, when the formal choice was made. At that time, despite the absence of many members, and because of the increased fighting in the streets and the possibility of the Sobor being driven from the Kremlin before nightfall, final action became imperative.

It was generally expected that the Metropolitan Anthony of Kharkof would be the spontaneous choice. Following the method used in the election of Patriarch Joseph I in 1634, a secret ballot was taken for the choice of three candidates. The choice fell upon Anthony of Kharkof, Arsenius of Novgorod, and Tikhon of Moscow.

These formalities had continued until November 5th. The names of the candidates had been sealed in uniform white rolls and deposited the night before in an urn placed before the renowned icon of the Mother of God. Father Alexis, the oldest of the recluse monks, thrust his hand into the urn and drew forth a roll containing the name of Tikhon of Moscow. Tikhon was then acclaimed "God's chosen one."

Tikhon was a man of great humility and piety. His unique and romantic career will be considered in a special chapter. He received his formal announcement in the Trinity-Sergei monastery; and took an oath to defend the Orthodox Church, even at the cost of his life.

Fortunately, the Bolsheviki had not as yet seized the Kremlin. The special committee was thus enabled to revise and adapt the old order for the enthronement of a Patriarch, and recover from the Patriarchal treasury the ancient office robes, together with the mitre, mantle, and white cowl of Patriarch Nikhon,[2] and the sceptre of Metropolitan Peter.[3]

The ceremony was fittingly conducted November 21, 1917. Following the liturgy, the Patriarch walked to his throne and then led a procession around the Kremlin, receiving tokens of respect even from the Red Guard.

When the Sobor resumed its sessions, the important question of the relative jurisdictions of the Patriarchate and the Sobor became the dominant issue. Two programs were submitted. One would have placed the Patriarch at the head of an aristocratic hierarchy, according to precedent. The other would make the Patriarch the head of a synodical body, democratically composed, expressing itself through a Synod containing large lay representation.

The final ruling was in the nature of a compromise and is similar to the relation of the Presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church of America to the General Convention. Supreme administrative authority was vested in a Sobor meeting periodically, composed of bishops, clergy, and laymen. The Patriarch was made the executive head with first place among bishops of equal rank, but subject along with other "types of Church administrators," to the Sobor. He was to convoke Sobors and preside at their sessions. Between Sobors two *ad interim* bodies were to function: the Sacred Synod and the Supreme Ecclesi-

[2] The greatest of Russian Patriarchs, ruling the Church 1653-60. Died 1681.

[3] Circa 1330. Under Metropolitan Peter, Moscow was made the administrative center of the Russian Church in accordance with the policy of Ivan Kalita (Money Bag). The Upensky Cathedral in the Kremlin was built 1326.

astical Council. The Patriarch was to be president of both bodies; and his veto was to suspend consideration of any question until the next meeting of the Sobor. He was also charged with the unenviable responsibility of making representations to the Government. While he continued his office as Metropolitan of Moscow, the actual duties of the office were confided to a *locum tenens,* with the title Archbishop of Kolomna and Mozhaisk. Finally he was made subject to impeachment by action of the Sobor.[4]

Dr. Matthew Spinka has so concisely and fairly summarized the duties of the internal administration of the Church as contained in the "Decisions Regarding the Supreme and Eparchal Administration of the Orthodox Church by the Sobor of 1917-18" that the conclusion of his chapter on the Sobor of 1917 is given in full:

"The two elective legislative bodies which were associated with the Patriarch in the management of the government, the Holy [Sacred] Synod and the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, divided between themselves the various functions appertaining to the administration. The Holy [Sacred] Synod, which was hierarchical in the character of its personnel, consisted of the president-patriarch and twelve bishops: six were chosen by the Sobor for the term of three years, five others represented the five ecclesiastical administrative divisions into which Russia

[4] 1. As this right of the Sobor played a large part in the life of the Church, we quote from the provisions as given in the "Decisions Regarding the Supreme and Eparchal Administration of the Orthodox Church by the Sobor of 1917-18," Warsaw, 1922, as given by Dr. Spinka:

"8. In case the Patriarch should fail in his duties, then, in accordance with the nature of the failure, the three eldest members of the Sacred Synod, or members of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of archiepiscopal rank, should make a brotherly representation to the Patriarch; should that representation fail of result, they should make a second representation; and in case this also is fruitless, they should adopt further measures in accordance with Article 10.

"9. Complaints against the Patriarch shall be directed to the Holy Synod through the eldest hierarch from the membership of the Synod.

"10. In case the Patriarch should infringe the rights or duties of his office, the question whether his acts involve culpability should be decided by a joint meeting of the Sacred Synod and the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council. His indictment and trial devolve upon the All-Russian Sobor of bishops, to which, as far as possible, the other Patriarchs and representatives of autocephalous Churches should be invited; in such a case, the indictment, as well as the condemnatory verdict, requires no less than two-thirds of effective votes."

was divided (the Northwest, the Southwest, the Central, the Eastern, and the Siberian, which included North America and the Japanese, Chinese, and Persian missions), and were invited in succession for the term of one year, and the number was brought up to twelve by the inclusion in the group of the Metropolitan of Kiev, who was granted this privilege in deference to the historic claims of his city, which is 'the mother of the Russian cities' and the original home of the Russian hierarchy. Eligibility for election by the Sobor was contingent upon the length of actual service in his particular episcopal see, which must be not less than two years. The functions of the Sacred Synod related mostly to the inner life of the Church. Its jurisdiction extended over the matters of administration, doctrine, liturgy, priestly as well as parochial education, discipline, supervision of the missionary enterprises, and censorship of religious books.

"The Supreme Ecclesiastical Council was more democratic in its character, and besides the president-patriarch, consisted of fifteen members: three bishops from the Holy [Sacred] Synod, selected by the Patriarch or the Sobor, the rest being selected by the Sobor and drawn from the following ranks: five were selected from among the lower clergy (either presbyters, deacons, or singers), six were laymen, and one was a monk representing the monastic order. The Council was elected 'for the period between the two Sobors (three years).' This, by the way, is the only definite mention of the length of the intervening period between the Sobors. Its sphere of activity concerned mainly the external relations of the Church, such as the administration, economics, and finances; business concerns such as the synodical press; direction of the academies; the legal aspects of the life of the Church, and similar matters.

"But there were many matters which required the joint deliberations of the two bodies. In such instances, both organizations met conjointly. Besides, members of both bodies had the right of initiation of any subject, by presenting it to the Patriarch, who then allocated it to the proper body for deliberation. All members were required to vote and to sign the decisions of their respective group. Decisions were passed by a mere majority vote. The Patriarch had the right of a veto and held the customary right to vote in case of a tie.

"The diocesan government was likewise modeled after this combination of the hierarchical with the democratic principles. The legislative body, known as the diocesan assembly, was democratically constituted of clerical and lay members, equal in number. This was a deliberative, legislative organization. The bishop, assisted by a Diocesan Council of five, three of whom were priests, was the executive head of the diocese,

but administered his territory in coöperation with the diocesan assembly. In case of a disagreement, the bishop could carry out his policy in spite of the opposition of the legislative organ, but was responsible for his action to the Sobor.

"Very remarkable, likewise, was the legislation concerning the election of bishops. The number of bishops was greatly increased, so that every large city had a bishop of its own. When an episcopal vacancy occurred, the bishops of the district, or, if there were no district organizations, the Holy Synod, prepared a list of candidates, including those nominated by the diocese. After the publication of this list of candidates in the diocese, all the bishops of the district, as well as such as had been appointed by the Holy [Sacred] Synod to take part in the election, together with the clergy and the laymen of the diocese, jointly voted for the nominee of their choice. In order to be elected, he must receive no less than two-thirds of the votes cast. The bishop-elect was then confirmed by the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council.

"Qualifications for the episcopal office comprised the following requirements: the candidate must be at least thirty-five years of age; he must be a monk, or an unmarried clergyman, or might even be a layman. In the case of clergymen or laymen, if the candidate did not assume the monastic vow, he must at least wear monastic garb. The candidate must likewise possess a fitting education, as well as the necessary moral qualities. He was elected for life.[5]

"Further democratization of the administration of the Church is noticeable in the division of every diocese into parochial districts, locally governed by parochial assemblies, consisting of all the clergy of the district, together with an equal number of lay representatives of the parishes. Each local parish was likewise governed by a local assembly, and the members of the parish were definitely registered as belonging to that one unit and no other; this, too, was an innovation of considerable importance, and indicated the new spirit which was introduced into the ecclesiastical administration. It might be mentioned that this blend of the episcopal with the presbyterian polities was not original with the Russian Church, as far as the Eastern communions were concerned, for an essentially similar scheme had been in operation in the Rumanian Church in Transylvania since 1868.[6]

---

[5] All the foregoing description of the duties and obligations of the Patriarchate and other organs of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administrations is based upon the official decisions already cited (Spinka). *Cf., Decisions Regarding the Supreme and Spiritual Administration of the Orthodox Church by the Sobor of 1917-18,* Warsaw, 1918, pp. 3 *ff.*

[6] *Cf.* Seton-Watson, *Transylvania since 1867,* in the *Slavonic Review,* June, 1925.

"Besides this really remarkable reconstruction of the administrative system of the Church, the Sobor declared the independence of the Church from the State in all religious and ecclesiastical matters, the monastic life was newly regulated, and the Edinovertsi were permitted to maintain their own bishops. The Sobor likewise encouraged preaching in the congregations, a thing which was formerly almost entirely neglected; addressed itself to the reorganization of clerical education; and provided measures for the support of the work of the Church." [7]

[7] Spinka, *The Church and the Russian Revolution,* pp. 92 *ff.*

CHAPTER II

Patriarch Tikhon

THE Patriarch Tikhon plays so important a role in the future history of the Church, that it seems desirable to give the following brief sketch of his life.

Patriarch Tikhon, whose civil name was Basil Ivanovich Bellavin, was born on January 19, 1865, in the village of Klin in Toropets of the Pskov Government, Russia. After his graduation from the Ecclesiastical Seminary in Pskov he entered the Petrograd Academy of Divinity from which he graduated in 1888. At Pskov his deeply spiritual traits were so marked that he was called by his fellow students "Arch Priest." At Petrograd, with prophetic insight, the students changed his title to "Patriarch." Upon graduation, he was appointed instructor in the Pskov Seminary. Modesty prevented Bellavin from aspiring to higher office; hence he did not follow the usual custom of students of the fourth year in announcing his intention of taking monastic vows. He graduated, therefore, from the Academy as a secular priest. In March, 1892, he embraced monasticism, assuming the name Tikhon. Soon afterwards, he was advanced to the office of Superintendent of the Cholm Seminary in the province of Lublin and later that of Rector of the Kazan Theological School. In a short time he returned to the Cholm Seminary as its Rector. October 19, 1897, he was appointed as a Bishop of Lublin, Poland, where his work was largely among Uniates and Roman Catholics. Under his administration, many Uniates returned to the Orthodox Church. On September 14, 1898, he

was appointed head of the American Orthodox Mission, with the title of Bishop of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. Throughout his Episcopate in America, he showed himself a worthy successor to his famous predecessor, Bishop Nicholas.

During his administration, the American Mission was made an Archdiocese, Tikhon being promoted to the rank of Archbishop. Two Sub-Vicariates, one of Alaska and the other of Brooklyn, were established in the new Diocese. Among his enduring acts were the establishment of an Ecclesiastical Seminary in Minneapolis, Minnesota, of St. Tikhon's Monastery, in Pennsylvania, and the building of St. Nicholas' Cathedral in New York, to which city the see was removed. The number of parishes increased from fifteen to seventy-five in the United States, and the first parishes were established in Canada. All of these parishes were organized on a self-supporting basis. Missionary activities were increased and many Uniates returned to the Orthodox Church. In 1917 Archbishop Tikhon was recalled, and transferred to the Archdiocese of Yaroslav, one of the oldest Dioceses of Russia. In 1913 he was appointed Archbishop of Vilna. In this field his training in America was invaluable in meeting the vexed problems of a Diocese composed largely of Uniates and Roman Catholics, and in overcoming the difficulties growing out of the animosities of the Russian Orthodox toward the Polish population.

When the World War broke out, the Archbishop showed much resourcefulness in the relief of the sufferings of the population of his Diocese, which had become the theater of the War. When Vilna was evacuated, Archbishop Tikhon shared with the army all the deprivations that followed, and assisted conspicuously in maintaining the morale of the soldiers.

On June 19, 1917, Archbishop Tikhon was elected the Metropolitan of Moscow upon the removal of Marcarino, who had become notorious in the Rasputin case. In the same year the Great Sobor was convened; and as we have seen, Metropolitan Tikhon was elected Patriarch. After November 21, 1917, when the Bolsheviks gained control of Moscow,

Patriarch Tikhon fearlessly undertook to defend the Church and to maintain the honor of Russia. He boldly protested against the confiscation of Church property by the Soviet, and against the ignoble Brest-Litovsk Treaty. He greatly incensed the Government by his famous letter to the Council of People's Commissary, October 13, 1917, condemning the cruelty of the Soviet. He was finally arrested, and celebrated his twenty-fifth anniversary as a bishop in jail, accused of counter revolutionary activities and resistance to the seizure of Church ornaments. While in jail, he was condemned by the Pseudo Sobor of 1923 and degraded. He was never brought to trial before a civil court, and was suddenly released. Upon resuming his duties, he promised loyalty to the Soviet Government, meaning thereby that he would not interfere with politics. A very large majority of the Orthodox approved the attitude of Tikhon, and continued to recognize him as the Patriarch. His struggle with the so-called Living Church which manipulated the Sobor of 1923 continued until his death.

The Patriarch's actions seem to be consistent in all respects. He himself states that his traditions were those of the extreme Tsarist party, but that his duty was to the Government under which he served. The first duty of the Church is that of loyalty to the established or *de facto* government within whose territories she exercises jurisdiction. Two conditions should always be considered: first, when a country is in revolution, and the outcome of revolutionary conflict in doubt, a leader of the people is at liberty to oppose an apparently successful revolutionary movement until at least a *de facto* government has been established. Life and liberty may be sacrificed by this course, but surely the loyalty of an individual or a Church is not involved. The plea for such liberty of action is enhanced when the revolutionary government is anti-religious. In the second place, it should be remembered that even under an established, or *de facto,* government, a prelate of the Church is bound to protest against any act that seems to him to be immoral, irreligious, or illegal.

With these principles before us, Tikhon's course is fully logical. He accepted the change in government after the revolution of March, 1917. When the October revolution occurred, and while the issue was in doubt, he continued his allegiance, and lent the weight of his support to the counter-revolutionists. He disregarded the opportunity, however, of lending his active assistance to the opponents of the Soviet, doubtless from the conviction that the Church should not prejudge an issue that has been left to the arbitraments of arms.

The acts leading to the imprisonment of Tikhon, his release from prison, and the opposition to the Living Church, are a part of the narrative.

The Patriarch died April 7, 1925, just before midnight. He had planned to return to the Donskoy Monastery the following day. Americans who were close observers of the Patriarch had reported a long time before his death that his enemies were trying to wear him out through petty persecutions. His rest was generally broken by untimely awakenings to discuss matters or request decisions which could easily have been delayed until morning. Under this stress he developed an illness which required his removal to a hospital. As he was preparing to leave the hospital, complications developed from which he died in a few hours, apparently from heart failure.

He was buried in the Winter Chapel of the Donskoy Monastery, near Moscow, one of the most ancient buildings in Russia. His body was placed under the pavement, and a monument resembling an altar placed over it. Behind this are the Patriarchal Cowl of the Patriarch Nikhon, used at the time of his elevation, together with his own cross and crozier. Lamps continually burn before his tomb and fresh flowers and branches always adorn it. The faithful still make it an object of pilgrimage and accord him a veneration like that shown the saints.

His burial was simple, but impressive. Vast throngs moved by his casket in absolute silence, unchecked by the Red Guards,

who in many cases joined the host that had come to do homage to one who was viewed as a confessor and martyr. History will doubtless bear testimony to the benignity of Providence in passing by the popular, vigorous, astute, but withal purblind Anthony of Kiev, and giving to the afflicted Church the humble Tikhon as its leader in times of stress. His humility was his strength. He could receive with meekness his personal sufferings, yet with the detached vision of the Saints discern his duty in that path of life into which it had pleased God to call him. The Patriarch's cowl was for him a crown of martyrdom. Today it is venerated by the masses as a token of him who, by his self oblation, saved the Church of their forefathers.

PART II

Patriarchate and Soviet

CHAPTER I. Separation of Church and State
CHAPTER II. Program of Godlessness
CHAPTER III. Despoiling the Church

CHAPTER I

SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

THE trials of the Patriarchate began almost with its establishment. Fortunately for a time the Patriarchate had the support of the Sobor, which, contrary to all expectation, was permitted to continue into the year 1918.

The first blow fell in December, 1917, when a decree nationalizing all properties was passed, expressly stating that this included all land belonging to ecclesiastical organizations. December 11, 1917, an edict was issued turning over all schools to the direction of the Department of Education. A few days later, December 18th, the State promulgated a law enforcing civil marriages and birth registration, and demanding that the Church hand over all records. Thus the Church was deprived of a traditional prerogative. In January, 1918, all financial aid to the Church was ordered withdrawn. Finally on January 23, 1918, the whole structure of the State as an essentially religiously guided institution, which had existed for one thousand years since the days of St. Vladimir,[1] was overthrown. This momentous historic document was at first published in the papers under the title of *Freedom of Conscience and of Religious Societies*;[2] but later it was incorporated into the Collected Laws under the caption of Separation of the Church from the State and the School from the Church,[3]

---

[1] St. Vladimir converted Russia to Christianity, 988.

[2] Prof. R. V. Gidulyanov, *Separation of the Church from the State,* 3d ed., Moscow, 1926, prints the official text of the document (in Russian).

[3] 1918, p. 203.

and since then it has retained that title. The text in full reads as follows:

"1. The Church is separated from the State.

"2. Within the confines of the Republic it is prohibited to issue any local laws or regulations restricting or limiting freedom of conscience, or establishing privileges or preferential rights of any kind based upon the religious confession of the citizens.

"3. Every citizen may profess any religion or none. All restrictions of rights connected with the profession of any belief whatsoever, or with the nonprofession of any belief, are annulled.

"Note: All reference to citizens' membership in religious groups, or their non-membership, shall be removed from all official documents.

"4. The governmental functions, or those of other publico-juridical institutions, shall not be accompanied by religious rites or ceremonies.

"5. A free performance of religious rites is guaranteed as long as it does not interfere with public order, and is not accompanied by interference with the rights of citizens of the Soviet Republic. Local authorities possess the right in such cases to adopt all necessary measures to preserve public order and safety.

"6. No one may refuse to perform his civil duties on account of his religious views.

"Exception to this rule, on condition that one civil duty be exchanged for another, may be granted in each individual case by decision of the People's Court.

"7. Religious vows and oaths are abrogated.

"8. Acts of civil nature are registered solely by the civil authorities and the departments for the registration of marriages and births.

"9. The school is separated from the Church.

"Instruction in religious doctrines is not permitted in any governmental and common schools, nor in private teaching institutions where general subjects are taught. Citizens may give or receive religious instruction in a private manner.

"10. All ecclesiastical or religious associations are subject to the general regulations regarding private associations and unions and shall enjoy no privileges or subsidies, whether from the government, or from local autonomous or self-governing institutions.

"11. Compulsory demand of collections or dues for the support of ecclesiastical or religious associations, as well as measures of compulsion or punishment adopted by such associations in respect to their members, are not permitted.

"12. No ecclesiastical or religious association has the right to possess property.

"13. All properties of the existing ecclesiastical and religious associations in Russia are declared to form national wealth. Buildings and objects specifically appointed for purposes of worship shall be delivered, in accordance with the regulations of the local or the central governmental authorities, to responsible religious associations for their use, free of charge." [4]

In response to this decree, the Patriarch, in his own name, during the Christmas recess of the Sobor, issued the following:

"The humble Tikhon, by God's grace Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, to the beloved in the Lord hierarchs, clergy, and all faithful members of the Russian Orthodox Church.

" 'The Lord deliver us from this present evil world' (Gal. 1:4).

"The Holy Orthodox Church of Christ is at present passing through difficult times in the Russian land; the open and secret foes of the truth are striving to destroy the work of Christ by sowing everywhere in place of Christian love the seeds of malice, hatred, and fratricidal warfare.

"The commands of Christ regarding the love of neighbor are forgotten or trampled upon; reports reach us daily concerning the astounding and beastly murders of wholly innocent people, and even of the sick upon their sick-beds, who are guilty perhaps only of having fulfilled their duty to the Fatherland, and of having spent all their strength in the service of the national welfare. This happens not only under cover of the nocturnal darkness, but openly in daylight, with hitherto unheard-of audacity and merciless cruelty, without any sort of trial and despite all right and lawfulness, and it happens in our days almost in all the cities and villages of our country, as well as in our capital, and outlying regions (Petrograd, Moscow, Irkutsk, Sevastopol, and others).

"All this fills our heart with a deep and bitter sorrow and obliges us to turn to such outcasts of the human race with stern words of accusation and warning, in accordance with the command of the holy apostle: 'them that sin reprove in the sight of all, that the rest also may be in fear' (I Tim. 5:20).

"Recall yourselves, ye senseless, and cease your bloody deeds. For what you are doing is not only a cruel deed; it is in truth a satanic act, for which you shall suffer the fire of Gehenna in the life to come, beyond the grave, and the terrible curses of posterity in this present, earthly life.

"By the authority given us by God, we forbid you to present yourselves for the sacraments of Christ, and anathematize you, if you still bear the name of Christians, even if merely on account of your baptism you still belong to the Orthodox Church.

---

[4] Spinka, *ibid.*, p. 104.

"I adjure all of you who are faithful children of the Orthodox Church of Christ, not to commune with such outcasts of the human race in any matter whatsoever: 'cast out the wicked from among you' (I Cor. 5:13).

"The most cruel persecution has likewise arisen against the holy Church of Christ, the blessed sacraments, sanctifying the birth of man into the world, or blessing the marital union of the Christian family, have been pronounced unnecessary and superfluous; the holy churches are subjected to destruction by reason of the gunfire directed against them (*e.g.,* the holy cathedrals of the Moscow Kremlin), or to plunder and sacrilegious injury (*e.g.,* the Chapel of the Saviour in Petrograd). The saintly monasteries revered by the people, as the Alexandro-Nevsky and Pochaevsky monasteries) are seized by the atheistic masters of the darkness of this world and are declared to be in some manner national property; schools supported from the resources of the Orthodox Church to train the ministers of churches and teachers of the faith are declared superfluous, and are turned either into training institutes of infidelity or even directly into nurseries of immorality.

"Property of monasteries and Orthodox churches is alienated from them under the guise of being national property, but without any right and even without any desire to act in accordance with the lawful will of the nation. . . . Finally, the government which is pledged to uphold the right and truth in Russia, and to guarantee liberty and order everywhere, manifests only the most unbridled caprice and crassest violence over all, and especially in dealing with the holy Orthodox Church.

"Where are the limits to such mockery of the Church of Christ? How and wherein may the attacks upon it by its raging enemies be stopped?

"We appeal to all of you, believing and faithful children of the Church, rise up in defense of our injured and oppressed holy Mother.

"The enemies of the Church seize rule over her and her property by force of death-dealing weapons; but you rise to oppose them with the strength of your faith, with your own nation-wide outcry, which would stop those senseless people and would show them that they have no right to call themselves protagonists of the people's welfare; initiators of a new life in accordance with the national ideal, for they are directly against the conscience of the people.

"And if it should become necessary to suffer in behalf of the cause of Christ, we invite you, beloved children of the Church, to suffer along with us in accordance with the words of the holy apostle: 'Who shall separate us from the love of God? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword?' (Romans 8:35.)

"And you, brethren, hierarchs and clergy, do not lose even an hour in your spiritual task, and with fiery zeal call upon your members to defend the impugned rights of the Orthodox Church; convene religious gatherings; appeal not because of necessity, but take your place in the ranks of spiritual warriors of your own free choice, and oppose to the external violence the force of your genuine spirituality; we then positively affirm that the enemies of the Church of Christ shall be shamed and shall be dispersed by the might of the cross of Christ, for the promise of the divine Cross-bearer is immutable: 'I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it' (St. Matt. 16: 18)."[5]

When the Sobor reconvened it passed several resolutions supporting the proclamation of the Patriarch, and aiming to make his pronouncements effective. The most important of these was the report of a special committee, which was adopted as the official answer to the Soviet Government. It reads as follows:

"The individuals wielding the governmental authority audaciously attempt to destroy the very existence of the Orthodox Church. In order to realize this satanic design, the Soviet of People's Commissioners published the decree concerning the separation of the Church from the State, which legalized an open persecution not only of the Orthodox Church, but of all other religious communions, Christian or non-Christian. Not despising deceit, the enemies of Christ fraudulently put on the appearance of granting its religious liberty.

"Welcoming all real extension of liberty of conscience, the Sobor at the same time points out that by the provisions of the said decree, freedom of the Orthodox Church, as well as of all other religious organizations and communions in general, is rendered void. Under the pretense of 'the separation of the Church from the State,' the Soviet of People's Commissioners attempts to render impossible the very existence of the Churches, the ecclesiastical institutions, and the clergy.

"Under the guise of taking over the ecclesiastical property, the said decree aims to destroy the very possibility of divine worship and ministrations. It declares that 'no ecclesiastical or religious association has the right to possess property,' and 'all property of the existing ecclesiastical and religious associations in Russia is declared to be national wealth.' Thereby the Orthodox churches and monasteries, those resting-places of the relics of the saints revered by all Orthodox people, become the common property of all citizens irrespective of their credal differences—of

[5] Vvedensky, *The Church and the Government,* pp. 114-116.

Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans—and the holy objects designated for the divine service, *i.e.,* the holy cross, the holy gospel, the sacred vessels, which the governmental authorities may either permit or not (as they wish) their use by the parishes.

"Let the Russian people understand that they (the authorities) wish to deprive them of God's churches with their sacred objects! As soon as all property of the Church is taken away, it is not possible to offer any aid to it, for in accordance with the intention of the decree everything donated shall be taken away. The support of monasteries, churches, and clergy alike becomes impossible.

But that is not all: in consequence of the confiscation of the printing establishments, it is impossible for the Church independently to publish the holy gospel as well as all other sacred and liturgical books in their wonted purity and authenticity.

"In the same manner, the decree affects the pastors of the Church. Declaring that 'no one may refuse to perform his civil duties on account of his religious views,' it thereby constrains them to fulfil military obligations, forbidden them by the 83d rule of the holy Apostles. At the same time, ministers of the altar are removed from educating the people. The very teaching of the law of God, not only in governmental, but even in private schools, is not permitted; likewise all theological institutions are doomed to be closed. The Church is thus excluded from the possibility of educating its own pastors.

Declaring that the governmental functions or those of other public juridical institutions shall not be 'accompanied by any religious rites or ceremonies,' the decree thereby sacrilegiously sunders all connections of the government with the sanctities of faith.

"On the basis of all the above-mentioned considerations, the holy Sobor declares:

"1. The decree published by the Soviet of People's Commissioners regarding the separation of the Church from the State represents in itself, under the guise of a law declaring liberty of conscience, an inimical attempt upon the life of the Orthodox Church, and is an act of open persecution.

"2. All participation, either in the publication of the law so injurious to the Church, or in attempts to put it into practice, is not reconcilable with membership in the Orthodox Church, and subjects all transgressors belonging to the Orthodox communion to the heaviest penalties to the extent of excommunicating them from the Church (in accordance with the 73d rule of the holy Apostles, and the 13th rule of the Seventh Ecumenical Council)." [6]

---

[6] *Ibid.,* pp. 111-114.

Opposition to this oppression was found in all parts of the Empire, often taking the form of an uprising, frequently of rioting. A sense of loyalty to a *de facto* government prevented the Patriarch from joining forces with the enemies of the Soviet who were still conducting an active and bitter warfare. There can be little doubt that, if Tikhon had openly joined with one of the opposing forces and invited all Orthodox to follow, the course of Russian history would have been changed. He did incur the active hostility of the Soviet by his vigorous denunciation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, in which Russia accepted such humiliating terms. This was done, however, more from patriotic motives and loyalty to the ideals of the nation, than as an act of disloyalty to the government.[7]

For many months after the publication of the January decree, most provisions were not enforced. The Fifth Convention of the Soviets in July put an end to this laxity by restating in most positive terms the underlying principles of the January decree "in order to guarantee the decree of conscience, the Church is separated from the government, and the school from the Church, and liberty of Religion as well as antireligious propaganda is granted to all citizens." By a subsequent decree on August 24th, members of all confessions, Orthodox, Old Ritualists, the Roman Catholic Church in all its numerous types and varieties, the Armenian, both Apostolic and Protestant, the Protestants as such, Islamic, Buddhist, Bramistic, and Lamaic faiths, as well as all benevolent and charitable groups, are all comprehended and sequestered in one decree, and deprived of all state recognition and aid, and further are penalized by loss of their juridical rights. This was especially aimed at holding communities which could

[7] There was precedent for this in the case of St. Philip, Metropolitan of Moscow, who ventured to rebuke Ivan the Terrible (1533-84) because of his vice and cruelty. He was removed from office and cast into prison, where he was reported to have died a natural death. His remains were sent to the great monastery at Sojazhsk. An examination of these remains late in the last century revealed marks of an ax on his neck and jaw bones, showing that he really died a martyr's death.

acquire Church properties under legally misguiding titles.

Spinka again has summarized fairly and adequately the resultant outcome of this in the volume already cited. Despite his apparent prejudice, he is so eminently fair in citing his source material that we quote his conclusions in full:

"The provisions of the January decree regarding the transfer of the churches to the governmental authorities were elaborated in the instructions by further detailed pronouncements. The property held by the Church at the time when the decree was issued was to be taken over by the local Soviets of Workers and Peasants; the local authorities were then directed to make an inventory of such property, comprising all articles used in worship or ritual, and with this inventory they were to turn the entire establishments over to the representatives of the group of believers which had applied for the use of it, from which time the congregation had a free possession of the premises. The number of local inhabitants required to obtain the use of church buildings and equipment was fixed at not less than twenty.

"After the formalities of transfer of this property into the custody of the group were complied with, the group then obligated itself to protect it as a trust of national property, to keep everything in good repair, and restore, at its own expense, anything lost or worn out; to pay the operating and running expenses, such as heating, insurance, and local taxes; to use the equipment solely for the purposes of worship; to keep an inventory of all newly acquired property (by bequest or transfer from another church) such as did not belong to any individual; and to permit an official inspection of the establishment during hours when the services were not in progress. In case these conditions were not strictly observed, the property immediately reverted to the local soviets.

"In the sample contract published along with the instructions, it was furthermore specified that groups taking over Church property for purposes of worship obligated themselves not to permit political meetings hostile to the government to be held in it, or speeches by any individual of such tendencies, or the delivery of sermons directed against the established regime, the selling of anti-governmental literature, or ringing of alarm bells for the purpose of arousing the population and inciting it against the government. 'In the event of failure to adopt all measures in our power to fulfil all our obligations under this Agreement, we shall be criminally liable and shall be treated with all the severity of the revolutionary law: and in such contingencies the Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies shall have the right to cancel this Agreement.' Of course, any member of the group had the right to withdraw at will, provided he gave

proper notice of his intention. But likewise anyone who wished to join the group had the right to sign the contract.

"In case there should not be found the required minimum number of believers to apply for a church building, the fact must be published in the newspapers, and a week after the appearance of the third such notice it must be reported to the People's Commissariat of Education, which would then make a disposition of the case. The equipment of the church would either be transferred to another church, or would be stored in a special storage provided for that purpose.

"All other property whatever, from which the Church drew revenue, such as houses not used for worship, land, factories, candle manufactories, industrial plants, cash capital, and all other property which had not been sequestrated hitherto, was ordered immediately to be seized. For non-delivery of any such capital, the guilty individuals were subject to the provisions of the criminal law. The term set for the surrender of all property was two months from the day of publication of the Instructions.

"Regarding the surrender of the registry books, the Instructions ruled that all such records kept by any communion or Church must be surrendered to the governmental authorities without delay. The clergy were granted the right to copy anything needed out of the books, but only after the originals had been surrendered.

"Religious processions, or performances of any religious ceremony in public, were permitted only after the application for the holding of such public meetings had been approved by the local authorities. It was furthermore specified that all monuments or tablets found in churches, commemorating the glories of the former tsarist regime, must be removed as 'insulting the revolutionary sensibilities of the working masses.'

"Finally, the Instructions amplified the provisions of the January decree regarding the teaching of the catechism by further details as follows:

"In view of the separation of the school from the Church, instruction in any religious creed must in no case be admitted in any stated, public, or private educational institutions, with the exception of purely theological establishments.

"All credits voted for religious instruction in schools shall be immediately stopped, and teachers of religion shall be deprived of maintenance.

"No state or other publico-juridical institution shall have the right to issue any money to instructors of religion either for the present time or due them since the month of January, 1918.

"The buildings of theological educational establishments of all con-

fessions, as well as of the parochial schools, shall be turned over, as national property, to the local Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies, or the People's Commissariat of Education.

"Note: The Soviet of Workmen-Peasant Deputies may lease or grant such buildings for the purpose of establishing in them special training establishments of any religious creed, on the general conditions applicable to all citizens, and with the knowledge of the People's Commissariat of Education.[8]

"Shortly after the publication of this supplementary legislation regarding the concrete methods of realization of the January Decree, the Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church, which had been in session since August 15, 1917, was dissolved on account of lack of funds, without completing its work. It was implied in course of its legislation that the next Sobor was to be held within three years, *i.e.,* in 1921, but this was not specifically and formally decreed. In the meantime, the Patriarch, with his two auxiliary governing bodies, was left to face the increasingly difficult situation alone."[9]

---

[8] Spinka, *op. cit.,* pp. 142-6.

[9] This important document was published in the *Izviestia* of Aug. 30, and is dated Aug. 24, 1918; *cf.* the full text in Gidulyanov.

CHAPTER II

The Program of Godlessness

WE MUST remember that the Russian nation was from the time of its acceptance of Christianity in theory and almost in practice a theocracy. The Tsar, following the precedent of the Byzantine Emperors, was the imperial ruler and the temporal head of the Church. This condition naturally freed the Church from political activities. There was no need of agitation in defense of the Church or the creation of a clerical party. The intelligentzia, hostile as a whole to absolutism in politics, viewed the Church with tolerance, and often with reverence. Thus there was no internal conflict to create a difficulty in accepting a *coup d'état* and adapting itself to a *de facto* government. This was made easier by the almost universal disgust at the influence and policies of Rasputin. Had the Kerensky régime continued, there can be little doubt that the Church under the Patriarchate would have prospered. Under the Soviet rule conditions automatically changed.

After the decree of Separation of Church and State, the Commissioner of Justice made a demonstration of equity in its execution. This did not, however, apply to the Tcheka, an inner group of quasi-officials who had almost absolute power of life and death. Through their good offices, executions of bishops and priests took place by the hundreds. Exact figures cannot be obtained. The London *Times* places the number as 28 bishops during 1918-19. In 1922 the All-Russian Central Executive Committee placed the number as 20 bishops and 1,414 priests. Bishop Nicolai Solovejtchik, of the Church of

Regeneration, on leaving Russia in 1926, summarizes the number thus: White clergy 2,691, monks 1,962, priests 3,447, a total of 8,100. Professors, teachers, physicians and other groups of the intelligentzia suffered in equal proportion.

A semblance of excuse for this was found in the claim that the clergy as members of the ecclesiastical household of the Tsar were allied with the Monarchists against Soviet Rule. It is true that many priests blessed the White Army. It must be remembered, however, that they did so as clergy of districts defending a *de facto* government against revolutionists, who had not as yet established themselves as rulers of the whole country; and that because of these actions they could not, and did not, remain in Russia after the collapse of their cause.

On the other hand, the Patriarch, while he never hesitated in denouncing the anti-religious policy of the government, was equally positive in his refusal to be drawn into acts of political disloyalty. Prince Troubetzkoy, former Minister to Belgrade, made the following statement:

"As a worker in the White Movement, I visited the Patriarch Tikhon and asked him to send his blessing to the White Armies, secretly, if necessary. I was expected to convey his blessing to the Don, and I guaranteed that this secret would not be disclosed. I endeavored to persuade the Patriarch to do this, for the reason that his blessing would greatly raise the morale of the troops. But the Patriarch was unmovable, and even in this decisive moment did not alter his conviction that the clergy must stand outside politics and political struggle." [1]

In a letter to the editor of the Russian newspaper *Rul,* published in Berlin, July 17, 1923, the Prince inserted into this interview the following correction, still further emphasizing the non-political attitude of the Patriarch:

"I did not ask the permission of the Patriarch to give his blessing to the troops of the Volunteer Army . . . I requested the permission of His Holiness to give in his name a blessing personally to one of the out-

---

[1] Quoted in Fedotoff, *The Russian Church Since the Revolution,* London, S. P. C. K., 1928, p. 35.

standing leaders of the White Movement, under conditions of maintaining absolute secrecy. However, the Patriarch did not find even this possible, so strongly did he hold himself aloof from any sort of politics."[2]

In his allocution on the first anniversary of the Revolution, the Patriarch, following the example of Ivan of Moscow in admonishing Ivan the Terrible, continues:

"It is not for us to judge earthly powers; all authority from God would draw unto itself our blessing if it were in truth the 'servant of God,' for 'rulers are not a terror to good works, but to the evil' (Rom. 13:3). However, to you who use your power for the persecution and the destruction of the innocent, we issue our word of admonition: celebrate the anniversary of your coming to power by the release of the imprisoned, the cessation of blood-letting, of violence, or ruination, of restraint of faith; turn not to destruction but to the construction of order and law; give to the people the respite from civil warfare which they have longed for and deserved. For otherwise the blood will be on your own head. 'For all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword' (St. Matt. 26:52)."[3]

The following year he went further and admonished the clergy of their duty in avoiding political strife.

On the plea that they were defending the state against the intrigues of the Patriarch and his party, the Soviet Government tried to justify a methodical attack on the Church, and the promotion of a Campaign of Godlessness.

In applying the Marxian principle of "exterminating the bourgeoisie as a class" one of the leading members of the Tcheka, Latzis, writes instructions:

"In drawing up evidence, do not look for incriminating material to prove that the person under prosecution acted by deed or word against the Soviet power. The first question which you must ask him is, what is his ancestry, education, or profession. These questions must determine the fate of the accused. Therein lies the meaning and the essence of the Red terror."[4]

To further its program the Soviet Government has or-

---

[2] *Rul* (Berlin Russian daily paper), No. 798, July 17, 1923.

[3] Fedotoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 36, 37.

[4] Michinkoff, *The Red Terror in Russia,* Berlin, 1924, pp. 187-8.

ganized the older students into a society known as the Comsomol (the Communist Youth Association). At a congress of this body in October, 1920, it adopted as its program:

"'Rearing its members to be convinced Communists, the Russian Comsomol conducts an ideological struggle with the religious plague which is consuming the young generation of workers and aids the representatives of the bourgeoisie to deceive the people.'[5] The reference here is not to the Church, as connected with the old régime, and not to one or another religious organization, but to the very principle of religious faith, which is so hateful to Communism."

"'We must act so that every blow to the traditional structure of the Church, to the clergy, etc., will be turned into a blow against religion in general.'"[6]

The following illustrates the method of executing this program:

"Every member of the Party is required to conduct anti-religious propaganda. For observing Church ceremonies (marriage, baptizing of children) he may be excluded from the Party. The same objective stands before the Comsomol. (Paragraph 5 of the Section concerning Political-Educational Work of the Russian Comsomol.)

"It was Christmas, 1922, that the Comsomol first brought its atheist propaganda out on the street, endeavoring, with its sacrilegious carnival, to insult the religious feelings of Christians. In all the chief cities of Russia, parades were organized as parodies of the Orthodox sacred processions. A Soviet semi-official correspondent picturesquely describes the 'Comsomol Christmas' in Moscow in the following manner:[7]

"'The God-fearing Moscow population saw a rare spectacle. From the Sadowa [Sadovaya] to the Place of the Revolution there stretched an unending procession of gods and heathen priests. It was a splendid method for learning about this thousand-year-old fanaticism. Here was a yellow Buddha with short feet and hands giving the blessing, squinting and exhaustingly roguish; and the Babylonian Marduk, the Orthodox Virgin, Chinese bonzes, and Catholic priests, the Roman Pope in his yellow tiara giving the blessing to new adepts; a Protestant pastor on a high pole; Russian priests in typical stoles, offering for a small price to marry anybody. And here a monk sitting on a black coffin with exposed

---

[5] N. Bukharin, *Programma Communistov,* p. 51.

[6] Quoted Fedotoff, *op. cit.,* p. 41.

[7] Fedotoff, *op. cit.,* p. 46.

relics. He is praising his wares for possible purchasers. A student from Sverdloff Communist University splendidly acts a comedy of priestly greediness.

"'We need no rabbis!
We need no priests!
Down with the bourgeoisie!
Down with the Kulaks!'

"Similar mockery took place all over Russia. Here and there the celebration was concluded by burning the 'gods,' as in Tiflis, where the day was made the occasion for turning over the former military cathedral to the Comsomol. The population, and not only the faithful, looked upon this hideous carnival with dumb horror. There were no protests from the silent streets—the years of terror had done their work—but nearly everyone tried to turn off the road when it met this shocking procession. I, personally, as a witness of the Moscow carnival, may certify that there was not a drop of popular pleasure in it. The parade moved along empty streets, and its attempts at creating laughter or provocation were met with dull silence on the part of the occasional witnesses." [8]

After ten years of effort on the campaign of Godlessness, especially through the efforts of the Comsomol, the following evaluation of their efforts, made at the Eighth Congress of the Comsomol, is of interest:

The Current Problems of the Comsomol

Where Are the Class Foes and the "Inner Traitors"?

. . . There is a series of hidden forms of activity among our class foes. I am speaking not of ideological tendencies, but about organizations in the cities and in the villages; organizations that have been legally authorized. Such, for instance, are the Church and sectarian organizations.

It would be intensely stupid on our part if we thought the Church and the Church organizations (Christian, Jewish, Mohammedan, and others) were the same as they were before the revolution. They are acting in quite another manner now.

At present a hasty, feverish tendency to be "modern," *i.e.*, to stand in touch with progressive forms of work, is visible. If the Orthodox priest cuts off his curls and the Jewish rabbi his sidelocks, this is only an outward symbol expressing the *great* change in the sphere of all forms of their work. This awakening is met with a certain success. In the textile

[8] *Izviestia* of V. Z. I. K., Jan. 10, 1923.

regions the workmen themselves sometimes collect money and build churches with it. In the Crimea the activity of the mullahs has also greatly increased. The Mohammedan clergy has decided to take the great step and admit women into their mosques. What an unheard of innovation! Lectures are being given here regarding moral life, regarding sexual relations according to the Koran, etc. All religious associations are constantly making use of such measures as organizing sewing groups for women, giving lectures against alcoholism and smoking. Thus they are taking away from us part of our educational work and adding it to their own activity, and in this way succeed by good endeavor in increasing their very bad, from our point of view, political capital. The sectarian organizations have also greatly increased lately. Even in Leningrad, with its most progressive labor class, the progress of the sectarians is undoubted. Different letters which we have received make us see that the working youth has been much more under the influence of the sectarians recently. We first thought that the Comsomol was the only organization for youth in our country, but we were mistaken. There exist numerous sectarian organizations which unite about the *same number of members as the Comsomol does.* The data of these organizations are very characteristic. For instance, in Stalingrad from sixty to seventy per cent of the members are workmen. All these Baptomols, Christomols, Associations of Believing Young Men and Women, etc., have united large masses of our young workmen and peasants.

Most of the sectarian organizations which work both among the adults and the youth struggle against alcohol, smoking, and swearing. Of course, as a result, they attract both in the cities and in the villages not the worst elements by far among our youth, especially among the girls of our working class, our young work women and peasant women. All this demands that we should make some important deductions for our Comsomol work. But of this I shall speak in the second part of my report.

. . . Of course, all these organizations cannot be put into the same boat. They have quite a different importance; they seek help from quite different social groups, their social standard is also quite different; their political views are not the same. They cannot be looked upon as one whole entity; therefore our methods of struggling against them cannot always be the same. For instance, there exist some collective labor communities which manage to exist quite without hired labor, yet have a strictly religious foundation. Comrade Treivass has spoken to us of them. But, on the other hand, there exist also false coöperative associations calling themselves by a religious name.[9]

[9] *Cosmolskaya Pravda,* No. 110, Moscow, May 13, 1928.

Two days later in the same journal we find the following:

THE COMSOMOL IN FIGURES. THE GROWTH OF THE ORGANIZATION

The reports and speeches given at the Eighth Congress of the Comsomol are characterized by the following feature: They discuss general, fundamental questions of the communist movement among the young people, but give scarcely any figures regarding the condition, development, social differentiation, etc., of the Association. . . .

What, then, does the Comsomol represent at the time of the Eighth Congress?

January 1, 1928, there were 1,936,000 members and 105,233 candidates in this organization; 22.4% were girls.

This two million mass of the Comsomol is divided into 67,698 groups (72.6% are in villages and 13% are in factories and transport institutions). From January 1 to December 1, 1927, 2,204 new groups were formed.

As far as social status goes there have been considerable changes during the two last years.

January 1, 1926, the number of industrial workmen in the organization was equal to 36%. January, 1928, this percentage had decreased to 35.2%, but at the same time the number of hired village laborers (batraki) increased.

January 1, 1926, there were only 7.7% "batraki"; after two years 8.3%. The total number of peasants has during the same time decreased from 46% to 45.5% while the number of the "others" has increased from 8.9% to 9.4%. The number of peasants had been growing till January, 1927, but since that time it has not only not increased, but actually decreased. On the contrary, the decrease which had been noticed "among the others" has been replaced by an increase. The growth of the peasant part of the *Association* took place chiefly among the middle-class peasants; the number of the poorest peasants has decreased not only relatively but even *absolutely (on 17.785).*

The number of older members has increased both relatively and *absolutely*. January 1, 1927, they made up only 11.5%; April 1, 1927, the percentage was 16.4%; at present the number of older members has risen to 313,000.

On the whole we must admit that the changes which have taken place in the social status of the V. L. K. S. M. are not satisfactory. Notwithstanding the immense fields from which the young working men's force can be attracted (47% of the guild industrials belong to the youth) we see as result that the per cent of workmen in the *Association* is decreasing.[10]

[10] *Ibid.*, No. III, May 15, 1928.

But a few days before, the following note had been sounded:

LET US PIN OUR COLORS TO OUR YOUTH

N. I. Bukharin in his report before the Congress of the V. L. K. S. M. (All-Russian Leninist Comsomol) of the whole U. S. S. R. spoke of the education of our youth.

. . . In the midst of our country the Church members, the sectarians, and the ideological Nepmen all put out their feelers toward our youth, trying to educate it according to the ideal of the bourgeoisie, that is, in its own image. It would be stupid to think that the contemporary Church has remained the same as it was in the last century. The Churches have become intensely modern. For instance the Mohammedan mosques can be entered by women; lectures on morality are being read there. The clergy organize schools of sewing; sermons on international situations are given in church, wall newspapers are printed; in short, both the Church members and the sectarians are quite up-to-date in their propaganda methods. Therefore, the struggle against religion demands a great effort and much attention on our part. Who is at the head of all these societies of total abstainers, teetotallers, Christian Associations, etc.? In many cases it is our class foes, the reactionaries. . . .

Other hostile ideological tendencies are also putting out their feelers toward our youth; for instance, nationalism. Antisemitism, this "socialism of fools," is also one of the anti-proletarian influences among the growing generation.

We are entering a period when the central figure among our laboring youth is a man who has not yet met his class foe in open battle. That layer of the Comsomol which took part in civil war is growing ever thinner and thinner. Therefore, it is quite natural that the younger elements will understand the general tendency of our up-building much less clearly, but on the other hand will feel all our sores and sickness much more acutely. Therefore, it is particularly imperative that we should preach to our youth the necessity of carrying on our up-building in a reasonable manner along the whole front.[11]

In the meantime the general program of Godlessness continued to hold a prominent place in the Soviet policy.

A. A. Valentinov in a collection of official statements called the "Assault of Heaven," closes his book with references to this and greater blasphemies:

[11] *Krasnaya Gazeta,* No. 124, Leningrad, May 7, 1928.

" 'Moscow—In the club in Moscow garrison a meeting took place in the presence of Trotsky and Lunatcharsky at which a trial against God was organized by the propaganda section of the Communist party. Five thousand Red Army men attended it.' [12]

"To this may be added the following description of that meeting given in a German paper which is rather notorious for its leniency toward Bolshevism:

" 'A trial took place.

" 'This time the accused was neither a social-revolutionary, nor a monarchist, but, if you like, a real monarch, our Lord Himself. He was charged with various ignominious deeds, and since He had the daring to be absent, He was condemned *in contumaciam.*'

"Having narrated further, in the same sarcastic manner, all the details of this absurd and disgusting performance, the author of the article remarks:

" 'Such are the ideas that the bolsheviks try to spread among the Russian peasant population which is deeply religious at heart.'

"But the nation will not stand infinitely such like scoffing of its beliefs:

" 'It will rise like the biblical pillar of fire, and with its big broad hand it will deal such a blow in the face of the red monkey-buffoon that the whole world will tremble.' " [13]

That this program has not changed during the course of years is illustrated by the following article:

The Association of the Godless

The Association of the Godless is a voluntary society, which unites all the workers who have decided to struggle against religion.

At present the Association numbers about 250,000 members. Of course, this figure is not considerable if we compare it with the actual number of godless living in the U. S. S. R.: One million party men, two million Comsomoltzy, etc. But still it is quite an appreciable figure and is constantly growing. In some of the organizations the growth of the membership within the last years has attained 200-300%. It is in the largest centers that the number of the godless is comparatively small. For instance the Leningrad Association of the Godless numbers no more than 13,000 men, and that of Moscow 7,000 men. In Ivanovo-Voznesensk there is only one city group of the Association. The present aim of the Association is to make it reach the masses, so that many million members should voluntarily take part in it.

---

[12] *Ost-Express* telegram of Jan. 30, 1923.

[13] *Berliner Tageblatt,* May 1, 1923.

What new layers of society ought to flow into this Association?

At present the Association of the Godless gives us approximately the following picture: 50% are party men or Comsomoltzy; 50% are non-party men; 80% are men; 20% are women; 60% belong to the cities; 40% to the villages.

This state of affairs is not quite satisfactory; the greatest number of the Godless do not belong to the part of the population which we most desire to attract. The aim of the Association is to attract the peasants, the women, and the non-party men.

The weak point in the Association is the work in the local groups. The total number of groups is only 6,000 and the work among them is not strongly developed; the general meetings are very often not assembled at all, the subscription fees not paid; the so-called International copeck, *i.e.,* the one copeck a year which is collected for the benefit of the International Proletarian Freethinkers, is also very inexactly paid in; the inspection committees do not work; the whole activity of the groups limits itself in most cases to one or two lectures and to the meetings of the groups. That is why the masses are indifferent to the work of the groups of the Association; that is why many of the groups are crumbling away.

But in this respect, too, the last year has brought a great change. The work of the leading organs of the Association has been specially directed to the activity of the groups. The Central Soviet of the Association has published two anti-religious text-books: one for the workmen anti-religious groups, and one for those of the peasants; it has also opened a competition for the best group of the Godless; the provincial soviets give instruction and revise the work of the city and village groups. Their reports are read during the meetings of the Central Soviet; the needs of the groups are discussed during the conferences, meetings, etc.

All these measures have greatly improved the work of the groups, have brought more life into them, and attracted the attention of wide social masses to the activity of the Godless. This year the work of the groups and of the "corners" has not been badly done. The anti-Christmas and anti-Easter campaigns have been interestingly carried out. The collection for the airplane, *The Godless,* is going on well.

An interesting kind of work of the Association has been going on in the villages. Here the Godless have decided to make their work more actively practical. For the money which had been collected at an anti-religious lecture, the group of the village Donzovka (Voroneje) organized a "hut-reading room," made an excursion to a model field, mended some bridges, farmed a model farm. In the village Novy (Vladimir)

the group of the Godless induced the village to adopt a more advanced form of farming, to close the church, to establish a school in the former rooms of the priest, and to organize a coöperative store and other useful institutions.

Some villages, for instance the village Tulutchevo, Voroneje Province, have become well known as model godless villages, thanks to group work. In Tulutchevo nearly all the work has been carried on by practical measures. A club has been established in the former church; in the house of the priest, a school. Formerly the school was crowded in the lodge of the church warden and contained only 30 children; at present there are 200, who attend by turn; the third turn is taken by adult illiterates. A tractor has been purchased and an improvement for the threshing machine. A new order of life is being established in the village; drunkenness and ikons are no more to be found. Instead of the religious ceremonies we now see the so-called "Red Weddings," the "October Festivals."

Dozens of such examples could be quoted. The aim of the Association's activity is to spread this successful form of work in all the groups; also to enlarge the network of groups in all the factories, clubs, other institutions, in the "hut-reading rooms," in the "red corners," in the "home coöperatives," etc.

We must speak with special attention of an important branch of activity undertaken by the association, namely the preparation of active leaders. In all the provinces and in many districts and other centers a widespread network of seminaries, courses, groups, etc., has been organized this year. . . . In Ivanovo-Voznesensk 30 qualified propaganda agents were set free from all their work for two months so as to be able to give all their time to anti-religious instruction; and after this term was over every district had several anti-religious lecturers and organizers. In a series of cities—Nijny, Moscow, Tashkent—special courses for the preparation of anti-religious organizers were held in autumn.

The Associations of the Godless take part in all kinds of preparatory courses: that of party leaders, of the comsomoltzy, of the women's section, of political and educational leaders, of the military, club, and school leaders, of the directors of the "hut-reading rooms," etc.

About 10 per cent (*i.e.* 25,000) of the total number belonging to the Association are active. Many of the active godless propaganda agents are pushed forward and elected for a wider professional and soviet scope of activity; they are elected as club leaders, as instructors, etc.

This year for the first time central anti-religious courses were organized in Moscow. Thirty members of the provincial active leaders took part in them. Such courses will be repeated each year.

Particular attention must be given to methods and the scientific part of the Association's activity. In many provinces we find experimental cabinets of the godless. In twenty provinces there exist anti-religious museums. Here we find not only posters, publications, but also a rich collection of exposed material: local "miracle working ikons," relics of saints, all kinds of amulets, statues of saints, etc. In some towns there are even more special anti-religious clubs. These have libraries and reading rooms; lectures are being given in them. "Godless corners" are organized, newspapers are posted on the walls.

Recently good use has also been made of the radio. The Central Soviet of the Godless broadcasts from the station of the Comintern about four or five reports a month. Many of them are then repeatedly broadcast by the provincial transmission centers. The radio reports are of two kinds: They either transmit current political and social events—so-called episodic communications—or they are cyclic, thus forming a kind of anti-religious radio self-education. Besides this, and with the aim of discouraging the masses from going to church every Sunday morning, a particular kind of anti-religious newspaper is being broadcast—short stories, current events, short articles. All this is intermingled with anti-religious popular songs, scenes, etc. The radio is used well in the provinces of Samara, Penza, and others. In Samara, it is already two years since lectures, newspapers, etc., began to be transmitted in this manner.

Among the artistic forms of anti-religious work we must name the so-called "living Newspaper." There are about 7 or 8 of them in Samara, in Moscow, in Leningrad, in the Tchernomorie, in Novgorod, etc. The Moscow living newspaper spreads its news to over 50,000 persons during its journey.

The publishing activity of the Association occupies an especially important place. The Central Soviet publishes three periodicals: The newspaper *Biezbojnik,* the journal *Biezbojnik,* and the journal the *Antireligioznik.* Besides this the Association has something of a monopoly for the publication of (anti-religious) text-books, manuals, and other school equipment.

National anti-religious work has also taken wider proportions. In the Ukraine we have the monthly journal the *Biezvirnik;* the Tartar section, "Dagrilar," has a fortnightly journal, *Fen-Em-Din.* Soon journals will be published in Kazan, in Bashkeria, and in some other places.

Even the provincial Associations develop some activity in the direction of publications. We can name the Briansk Association which has published a series of 24 letters on the question of anti-religious education. The Tver Association has published a large methodical collection.

Some work in this line has been also done by the Voroneje, the Kuban, and the Kostroma provinces.

Some provinces, for instance those of Samara, Penza, Voroneje, and others, make use of the party and soviet press for their anti-religious propaganda. The other provinces are gradually following suit.

The last section of the work which we wish to mention is the foreign section. The Association of the Godless is a member of the International Proletarian Freethinkers which have a membership of 2,000,000, mostly social democrats. The aim of the Godless is to inculcate to the West European movement the liberty loving viewpoint of Lenin in the question of anti-religious struggle; *i.e.,* in the connection which exists between anti-religious propaganda and the current problem of class strife.

To further this aim the Association furnishes the West European press with articles, supplies it with information, takes part in the meetings of the Executive Committee and in the Congresses, etc. In the course of a short time two delegations of freethinkers have visited the U. S. S. R., being invited to do so by the Association of the Godless. Since their return to their countries they have published some booklets describing their impressions, and are now leading an active propaganda against the war which is being prepared for and for one undivided front with the laboring masses of the U. S. S. R.

During the last congress of the I. P. F. (January 1st) a communistic majority was attained in the newly elected Executive Committee. All this opens wide perspectives before the Association of the Godless in the realm of international anti-religious work. Along general lines, such is the activity of the Association of the Godless.

If we cast even a cursory glance at the immense task which has been set before anti-religious propaganda as a result of the educational revolution, we shall immediately see how very insignificant the work of the Association still is.

Even yet the religious organizations, though they have been very much demolished by the October Revolution, are still mightier than the Association of the Godless. There are 200,000 preachers, priests, and missionaries; there are a great number of prayer houses for meetings, a very considerable yearly budget for the spreading of the work; about 30 publications; a series of religious schools for the preparation of propaganda agents, etc.

The Association of the Godless will be able to play an important part in anti-religious propaganda only—the work will be carried on not by one but by all of the party-soviet, professional, and social organizations.

This has unfortunately not been the case till now.

It has been the great merit of the Association of the Godless—and it was no easy matter for it to achieve it—to insist on a decisive change of action and the issuing of positive instructions from all the organizations in the matter of more energetic anti-religious struggle.

At present we see a complete change of view in this realm. All organizations—the P. U. R. (Red Army Educational Clubs), the V. Z. S. P. S. (All-Russian Central Grade Unions), and the Narcompross (Peoples Commisariat of Education), and the Z. L. V. L. K. S. M. (All-Russian Leninist Comsomol)—all give considerable attention to anti-religious propaganda and to the work of the Association of the Godless.

The resolution carried by the Fifteenth Congress has awakened the attention of the party and of social opinion still more to the anti-religious question. There is no doubt that thanks to this the Association will have greater possibilities for spreading its work, for strengthening its ranks, for transforming the union into one of many million volunteer workers.

To achieve this is the present aim of the Association of the Godless.

F. OLESCHUK.[14]

This is sufficient to show that the hatred of religion among the Bolsheviks is more bitter than that of the Revolutionists in France. Every religion is attacked. The Mohammedans suffered less molestation, because of fear of Angora and a desire to extend the Soviet influence into Afghanistan and neighboring countries with large Moslem populations. At the same time they have encouraged a revival of the ethnic religions which underlie the folklore of the component peoples of the Russian Empire. As a result we find a strange trend toward paganism, shaping itself into the form of dualism, at once cosmic and revealed.

---

[14] *Revolution and Culture,* No. 3, 4, Moscow, 1928.

CHAPTER III

Despoiling the Church

IN THE midst of the condition of civil warfare which virtually existed between Church and State came the drought and famine of 1921. Crops failed in the Volga region and were largely reduced in other districts. This terrible drought affected almost forty million people; about four thousand died of starvation. The Patriarchate arose to meet the emergency and appealed to Churches throughout the world. Russian Orthodox in Russia sacrificed themselves to the utmost. The Church was evidently prepared to sacrifice its most treasured possessions. Unfortunately, before this last token of love for mankind could be shown, the Government interfered in its usual bungling fashion. With the crown jewels, valued at a fabulous price, in its possession, it decided first to tax the resources of the Church. December 9, 1921, it promulgated the following:

"Decision of the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee:

"Taking into consideration the long list of solicitations from various religious societies asking for permission to make collections for the relief of the starving, the Presidium of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee decided:

"1. To permit the ecclesiastical authorities and the various religious societies to make the collections;

"2. To direct the CENTROPOMGOL (The Central Committee for Aid of the Starving) to enter into an agreement with the religious

societies about the method of collection of contributions, having in view the wishes of the donors.

"M. Kalinin, President, A. C. E. C.
"A. Enukidze, Secretary, A. C. E. C.

"Moscow, Kremlin, December 9, 1921."[1]

Unfortunately, at the critical moment the *émigré* Churchmen, speaking through the Synod of Karlowitz, composed of prelates, likewise *émigrés,* addressed the Geneva Conference of 1922, in behalf of the monarchy, making at the same time an appeal to Baron Wrangel to enforce their program. The appeal closed with these words:

" . . . If during this conference, or afterwards, the Bolshevik regime in Russia should receive recognition as the legitimate one, there will result Bolshevik uprisings in one country after another. Their success or prevention depends upon the following measures: (1) upon non-recognition of Bolsheviks on the part of all governments, (2) upon the terrible havoc wrought by the famine, cold, and epidemic at present devastating Russia, which has been caused by the Bolshevik mismanagement. Peoples of Europe and of the world, have pity upon this nation, and equip its sons with arms; then they, together with their dear comrades—officers, generals, and soldiers—will be ready to spring up and march into Russia, to rescue it from its enslavement by the robbers."[2]

The action of the Karlowitz Synod was severely criticized even by many *émigrés.* To the more moderate elements among them it was obvious what a disastrous effect the pronouncement necessarily must produce in Russia. The former Minister of Confessions under the Kerensky government, A. Kartashev, condemned the political activity of the Synod as both unwise and in the extreme injurious. Prince Gregory Trubetskoy, who had fought in the White Guard armies, publicly declared that, in all his dealings with the Patriarch, the latter always resolutely refused to commit himself in any way to the White Guard's position, and that he opposed the Karlowitz Synod.

[1] N. N. Stsolietov, *The Church and the Government in Accordance with the Soviet Law,* 1923, pp. 21-2; *The Black Book,* p. 158.

[2] From a speech of Krasikof at the trial of Metropolitan Benjamin. *The Revolution and the Church,* 1-3, 1923, p. 83. Cited by Spinka, *op. cit.,* p. 168.

Such interpretation by one not in sympathy with the Church helps to gainsay the claim of the Soviet authorities that the Patriarch was in a state of continued rebellion and intrigue.

Acting evidently under official inspiration,[3] many appeals went to the government, demanding the use of Church treasures. A striking example is quoted by Spinka:

"Although there is no doubt whatever that the need was overwhelmingly great, and the government really hard-pressed for means to save the famishing, and the Church ornaments of gold, silver, and precious stones lay at hand offering ready means of at least partially relieving the emergency, let it not be forgotten that at the same time the Soviet authorities had the disposition of the former imperial jewels, the aggregate value of which was estimated, when I saw them in Moscow in the summer of 1926, at five hundred million rubles. It would be interesting to know how the retention of these treasures would be justified in the face of the supposed irresistible urgency and necessity for confiscating the Church treasures."[4]

Far from desiring to shun their responsibility for their famine-stricken brethren, general assemblies of congregations everywhere voted a contribution in money in lieu of the confiscation of their church ornaments. As an example we may refer to the action of the two hundred families forming the Congregation of the Church of St. Ermoly:

"All who spoke protested against the requisition; it was proposed that money should be taken instead. A resolution to that effect was carried unanimously."[5]

The Patriarch patriotically urged all congregations to donate all unconsecrated objects of value for the relief of the starving. The government on the other hand, while still retaining the crown jewels, inspired violent attacks against the

[3] Evidence of this is abundant in *Patriarch Tikhon and His Church:* I. Brekhonichev, Moscow, 1923, p. 11 *ff*.

[4] Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 172.

[5] *Pravda,* No. 70 (1509), Feb. 28, 1923.

Patriarch for refusing to save the lives of the people. This was but a method of paving the way for the decree of Kalinin, February 23, 1922, ordering the removal of Church treasures not in actual use for the purpose of worship. This was augmented by the decree of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee demanding:

"1. To instruct local Soviets to remove from the ecclesiastical property, which was delivered for the use of groups of believers of all religions upon inventory and contract, within a month from the day of publication of this decree, all valuable objects of gold, silver, and precious stones, the removal of which cannot actually interfere with the interests of the cult itself, and to transfer them to the offices of the People's Commissariat of Finance, with the special designation for the Fund of the Central Commission for Aid of the Starving.

"2. In order that this measure may be properly executed, each *gubernium* must organize a commission of responsible representatives of the *gubernial* executive committee, of the *gubernial* commission of aid for the starving, and the *gubernial* financial department, under the presidency of one of the members of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, for the purpose of giving an exact account of the abovementioned valuables as well as for their transfer to the organs of the People's Commissariat of Finance, and for the purpose of rendering a special account to the Central Commission of Aid for the Starving.

"3. Revision of the contracts, as well as the actual removal of the valuables after their inventory, must be done in the required presence of the representatives of the group of believers to whose use the property was transferred.

"4. The removed property shall constitute a special fund and be accounted for separately, and must be used exclusively for the needs of the starving, in a manner specified in a special instruction prepared by the Central Committee for Aid of the Starving, with the consent of the People's Commissiariat of Finance, and the Commission for the accounting, removing, and collecting of the valuables.

"5. A report of all the valuables taken from the ecclesiastical property, and of their disposition, shall be made periodically in the newspapers by the Central Committee for the Aid of the Starving, and at the same time the local papers must give a detailed description of the valuables taken from the local churches, places of prayer, synagogues, etc., with the specification of the name of those churches." [6]

[6] *Izviestia,* No. 46, Feb. 26, 1922.

To this the Patriarch issued the following:

"By the grace of God, humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, to all faithful children of the Russian Orthodox Church.

"May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Among the heavy calamities and trials which befell the world on account of our lawlessness, the greatest and most terrible is the famine which affected wide regions inhabited by many millions of people. As early as August, 1921, when rumors about the terrible calamity began to reach our ears, we, regarding it our duty to come to the aid of our suffering spiritual children, addressed a message to the heads of the several Christian communions (to the Orthodox Patriarchs, the Roman Pope, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of New York), appealing to them, for the sake of Christian love, to make collections of money and provisions for the starving Volga region people.

"At the same time, an All-Russian Committee of Aid for the Starving was organized, and money was being collected in all churches, as well as among the various groups, to be devoted to the aid of the famine-stricken. But such a Church committee was declared superfluous by the Soviet government, and all sums already collected by it were ordered to be turned over (and were turned over) to the governmental committee.

"However, in December, we were requested to collect, through the instrumentality of the administrative organs of the Sacred Synod, the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, the eparchial councils, and the diocesan and parochial councils, money and provisions to aid the starving.

"Desiring to coöperate with every possible effort to aid the starving people of the Volga region, we found it possible to permit the parochial councils and societies to sacrifice, for the needs of the starving, the valuable ecclesiastical ornaments and objects which were not used for the divine services, and we announced this to the Orthodox population on February 6/19 of this year by a special proclamation which the authorities permitted to be printed and distributed among the people.

"But there followed violent attacks upon the spiritual leaders of the Church by the governmental newspapers, and then the All-Russian Executive Committee, in a rescript dated February 13/26, regarding aid to the starving, ordered all valuable ecclesiastical objects, including even the consecrated vessels and similar objects used in celebration of the divine services, to be removed from the churches.

"From the point of view of the Church, such an act is sacrilegious, and we esteem it our sacred duty to make known the view of the Church regarding the act and to inform our faithful children about it.

"In view of the extraordinarily disastrous circumstances, we per-

mitted the possibility of sacrificing Church objects which were not consecrated and were not used in the divine services. We exhort all faithful children of the Church even now to make such sacrifices, desiring only that they be the response of a loving heart to the needs of their neighbor, so that they may actually manifest genuine help to our suffering brethren. But we cannot approve the removal of the consecrated objects from our churches even though it were by way of a voluntary surrender, for their use for any other purpose than the divine service is prohibited by the canons of the Ecumenical Church, and is punishable as a sacrilege; in case of laymen, by excommunication; clergy by degradation from the sacerdotal rank. Given in Moscow, February 15, 1922."[7]

This was effective in restraining most priests from obeying the governmental mandate. At least fourteen hundred and fourteen uprisings occurred. Despite these, vast treasures were seized, followed by wholesale arrests, trials, and executions.

The retribution that was meted out to those who resisted requisition and confiscation was speedy and thorough, as is shown by the following quotations chosen at random from official sources:

"Moscow, 11. V.—Yesterday the papers published the verdict of the court in the case of persons accused of propaganda against the confiscation of church valuables. Twelve people have been sentenced to death; 4, to 5 years', 13, to 3 years', and 10, to 1 year's imprisonment. It is said that the total number of accused amounts to 54, of whom 20 belong to the higher clergy."[8]

"The Court has passed the sentence of capital punishment upon the priests Zaosersky, Dobroliubov, Christoforov, Vishniakov, Orlov, Friasinov, Sokolov, Teliegin, as well as upon the citizens Broussilova,[9] Tikhomirov, and Rakhanov."[10]

"Kharkov, 22. VIII.—In Krplevetz, in the province of Tchernigov, a big trial of the clergy and the monks of Rychlovsky monastery has been brought to an end. The severest penalty, *i.e.,* death, has been applied to the prior of the monastery and to Father Rodtchenko. At the same time it has been decided to abolish forever the monastery as the nest of counter-revolutionaries and to hand over the objects of service to other Church communities" (No. 62).[11]

---

[7] *Black Book,* Appendix I, pp. 253-4. [8] *Izviestia,* May 10, 1922.

[9] The daughter-in-law of General Broussilov.

[10] *Pravda,* No. 101, May 9, 1922. [11] *Pravda,* No. 188, Oct. 23, 1922.

The confiscation of church ornaments was by no means confined to the Orthodox Church. Thus we read:

"Lvov, 2. V.—In consequence of the decree referring to the confiscation of the Church valuables, the Bolsheviks have plundered the Roman Catholic church in Kamenetz. The valuables were heaped up in a pile in the yard. A crowd of parishioners came and began to take them. To disperse the crowd three detachments of Kossacks were ordered to the spot, but were unable to do anything. Only the bayonets of the Red Army proved to be of some avail. Among the arrested was the Deputy-Bishop of Kamenetz-Podolsk, Prince Nedzielsky." [12]

"Minsk, 3. V.—The confiscation in the Roman Catholic churches was fixed for May 2d. The priests refused to give up the keys and to present themselves at the confiscation. Two of them, Lissovsky and Vassilevsky, have been arrested. Their case will be shortly heard in the tribunal. On the same evening the Polish commissary of repatriation was arrested on the charge of conducting counter-revolutionary agitation in the church and calling the confiscation, robbery." [13]

Lissovsky, Vassilevsky, and Tomashevsky were sentenced to three and five years' imprisonment.

Or of the suffering of the Jews:

"The revolutionary tribunal of Odessa has sentenced Rabbi Gurovitch to 2 years of imprisonment and 300 million roubles fine for insulting the commission dealing with the confiscation." [14]

The extent of confiscations, and often robberies, caused a devastation which is illustrated by the following picturesque description given by the correspondent of the *Berliner Tageblatt,* a paper rather notorious for its leniency toward the Soviet Government. Its correspondent, Herr Paul Scheffer, thus described the "dead Kreml" in his December letter from Moscow:

"The damage cannot be described by merely quoting the inventory list. What impresses one most deeply is the loss of the general picturesque effect of the internal decorations of these cathedrals, of their gentle yet depressing mysteriousness. It is gone. Formerly, thousands of big and tiny candles used to shine here out of the darkness (only above, near

[12] *For Freedom,* No. 147, May 3, 1922.
[13] *Pravda,* No. 99, May 6, 1922.
[14] *Rul,* No. 457, May 19, 1922.

the cupola, some light broke through). Their light shone and showed reflections upon silver and gold, upon the rich cloths and dark faces of the saints, and the massive outlines of censers and the heavy splendor of the vestments.

"From the eighteenth century on, the custom was established to leave open only the faces, the hands and the feet of the saints, and to cover all the rest with gold or silver; and it was mostly these dusky coats-of-mail on all walls and columns and at the altars, upon which the light of wax candles played its reflections, that filled the churches with solemn flowing life, which came no one knows where from. . . . Now all these vestments have been removed. . . . Even the silver badges from the brass cases which covered the tombs of the Patriarchs have been taken away. Brocade coverings are thrown into piles upon the floor or packed in boxes. All the tapers, censers, and silver candle-holders have been sent to be melted down. Only the gift of the Cossacks which they took back from the French who requisitioned it in 1812—a massive candle-holder in the Archangel Cathedral, weighing about 400 Kgms.—has been left. It has been spared, "as a specimen," that people might see what riches there used to be here. Some historical relics, of little value, have also been left. But the general impression is that of an appalling bareness. The silver shrine from the tomb of Metropolitan Peter, which covered his image, had been torn off and his head, hands, and feet may be seen now on the dark wooden board to which a seal has been affixed. This spectacle is nauseating. The Bolsheviks have been more systematical and ruthless about the place than the French in 1812. Even all the sacred vessels have been removed, since in the Kreml churches no services are held. The famous door with its golden carvings, in the Cathedral of Annunciation, has been left simply because it was impossible to remove it. But from the famous ikon of Saviour over that door, before which the false Demetrius had prayed, the silver garb has been torn off, and only a rough wooden plate may be seen, covered with something black and sticky, with but a faint outline of the head upon it. And such have become all the old ikons of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries." [15]

These trials continued for many months. The clergy of Petrograd suffered most grievously. Among the victims of this persecution was Benjamin, Metropolitan of Petrograd. Of his trial, Dr. Spinka writes:

"The charge leveled against Metropolitan Benjamin was that he, after receiving the patriarchal proclamation of February 28th, presented

[15] *Berliner Tageblatt,* Dec. 5, 1922.

the civil authorities with an 'ultimatum' in which he demanded a proof that the government had exhausted all other sources of possible revenue; a guarantee that the ecclesiastical valuables would be used exclusively to aid the famine-stricken; and finally reserved a proviso that Patriarch Tikhon's consent to the proceedings must be secured (this after the latter's proclamation of February 28th). Receiving no answer from the *Pomgol,* the Metropolitan ordered the patriarchal proclamation to be read in the parishes, thus making himself equally responsible for branding the action of the government as sacrilegious.

"Thereupon the Petrograd Soviet invited the Metropolitan for an interview, and induced him to abandon the first and the third point, while they granted the second, which permitted three Church representatives to oversee the work of the Commission to Aid the Starving. But later (March 12th) the Metropolitan recalled his representatives, making much more strict demands upon the authorities. Thereupon they dropped the parleys. Benjamin then issued a second proclamation to the people, which resulted in numerous and bloody disorders.[16] Aside from this, the prosecution charged him with a number of specific acts, as calling together councils of his clergy and of the parishes to impart to them instructions respecting opposition to the decree, making inciting speeches, etc.

"Among those who were called to testify in the trial were members of the Petrograd clergy, Krasnitsky and Vvedensky, both of whom later became ringleaders of a revolutionary movement within the Church, resulting in a schism. Both bore testimony essentially unfavorable to the accused, especially to Metropolitan Benjamin, and this act of theirs constitutes, in the estimation of the conservative party which came to be known under the designation of 'patriarchal,' the greatest blot on the character of these leaders of the opposing faction. They had been deprived of their office by the Metropolitan, and therefore the patriarchal party claimed that subsequently they had no right to participate in any ecclesiastical action. It may be confidently affirmed that much of the fierce hatred between the parties is traceable to this action of the two priests who testified against their own ecclesiastical superior in a trial which resulted in the imposition of the death sentence upon him and others, as well as to the Metropolitan's action against them.

"The trial finally resulted on July 6, 1922, in a verdict which imposed the death penalty upon ten of the accused and confiscation of their property. The rest of the accused were sentenced to hard labor or a prison term extending from seven days to three years. But the All-Russian Central Executive Committee found it possible to change the

---

[16] *Izviestia,* No. 132, June 16, 1922.

sentence of the Petrograd revolutionary tribunal in a number of cases, and six of the ten death sentences were changed to imprisonment; the remaining four, however, comprising Metropolitan Benjamin, Professor Novitsky, a former member of the Duma, Shein, and Kovsharov, were duly executed. They are now regarded by the patriarchal party as martyrs."

But little information crept out of Russia regarding the execution of Metropolitan Benjamin. The following are the most authentic accounts reaching us:

1. "The correspondent of the *Riga Courier* reports: On September 2d the rumor was spread in Petrograd that Metropolitan Benjamin has been executed. A crowd consisting mainly of women assembled in front of the prison in which the Metropolitan was kept. The agents of the State Political Department (formerly Extraordinary Commission) tried to disperse the crowd, but were unable to do so. The numerous arrests did not frighten the crowd which demanded that the Metropolitan should be shown to them. Then the *tchekists* (the special police) resorted to shooting; the crowd at first fled away, but then returned and became still more insistent. The warden of the prison proposed to choose three people to whom he would show the Metropolitan. That was agreed to; the three deputies went to the prison and ascertained that the Metropolitan was really alive."[17]

2. "A certain Mr. Ch. who has just arrived from Petrograd reports the following details of the execution of Metropolitan Benjamin and his colleagues, Archimandrite Sergius Shein, a former member of the Imperial Duma, and Professor Novitsky, all of whom were condemned to death:

"Fearing the indignation which was provoked by the verdict among the working masses, the Bolsheviks dared not carry out the execution in Petrograd. They spread the rumor that the Metropolitan was being taken to Moscow, whereas actually he and two other martyrs—Archimandrite Shein and Professor Novitsky—were marched away to the station Porokhovyie to be executed there. They were all shaved and dressed in rags to make them unrecognizable.

"At the moment of the execution Metropolitan Benjamin fainted and he was shot while unconscious. Archimandrite Shein had the courage to address the executioners with a short allocution explaining to them that they had just shot Metropolitan Benjamin."[18]

---

[17] *The Last News* (Reval), No. 742, Nov. 19, 1923.
[18] *Rul*, No. 45, No. 5, 1923.

"It is interesting to observe that the Supreme Church Administration, a revolutionary clerical organization which had succeeded in seizing the supreme power in the Church, added to the sentence passed by the civil tribunal an ecclesiastical sentence of their own; they deprived Metropolitan Benjamin of his priestly and monastic rank; excommunicated the laymen Novitsky, Kovsharov, and two others from the Church; deprived five other high ecclesiastical dignitaries of their priestly rank and office, and eight priests of their office, and passed milder ecclesiastical sentences upon the rest."[19]

The Moscow trial of the Roman Catholic dignitaries, Archbishop Cieplak and Vicar-General Budkievicz, had probably been advertised much more widely in Western Europe and America than the trials of the Orthodox hierarchs. But the charges against them were of essentially similar character, and likewise resulted in the death penalty for one. Both Cieplak and Budkievicz were to be shot, five others were sentenced to ten years' imprisonment, and eight others to a prison term of three years. Archbishop Cieplak and Vicar-General Budkievicz appealed to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, which, it would seem, under the pressure of the deluge of protests which came from the western parts of Europe and from America, mitigated Archbishop Cieplak's sentence to imprisonment for ten years. The death sentence passed upon Vicar-General Budkievicz, however, was confirmed and carried out. It may be remarked that Archbishop Cieplak was released from prison within two years.[20]

A similar trial of the Orthodox clerical leaders and laymen was held in Smolensk and resulted in four death sentences,[21] besides lesser punishment inflicted upon a number of others. In Moscow, Archbishops Arsenius and Seraphim, and Bishop Ilarion, and almost all the members of the Supreme Church Administration and the Moscow Eparchial Council were brought to trial. As in the previous processes, death sentences were passed on eleven of the accused, while the rest

---

[19] Cited from *Revolution and the Church,* 1-3, 1923, pp. 101-102.

[20] *Ibid.,* 1-2, 1924, pp. 39-86.

[21] A fuller account of this is given in Part V, Chapter III.

suffered from one to five years' imprisonment.[22] During the trial, so much incriminating evidence against Patriarch Tikhon and Archbishop Nicander, his intimate co-laborer, was gathered, that finally, on May 9th,[23] the Moscow tribunal directed that Patriarch Tikhon (Citizen Belavin) and Archbishop Nicander (Citizen Fenomeno) be brought to trial and sent the collected evidence against them to the People's Commissariat of Justice.

"The Patriarch was charged with being in direct communication with monarchist organizations abroad, and with counter-revolutionary activity directed toward the overthrow of the existing regime at home; besides, he was indicted with the crimes of inciting the masses to revolt. Thus the net result of the stand taken by the Patriarch in his proclamation of February 28th, if we may believe a source which otherwise is none too accurate in detail, was that fifty-five courts held two hundred and thirty-one trials, in which seven hundred and thirty-eight accused were tried; out of this total forty-four were sentenced to death." [24]

Dr. Spinka fails to mention that in the Moscow trial the Patriarch testified that he alone was guilty, as the author of the February edict, and that he alone should bear the penalty. This led to his imprisonment; and gave opportunity and excuse, if not occasion, for the outbreak of revolt within the Church.

The first news of the serious limitations of the Patriarch's personal freedom came in the beginning of 1919 (February-March). He was formally arrested and imprisoned, first in a monastery, then in the prison of the State Political Department (S. P. D.), in the autumn 1922; and accused of the following crimes:

1. That he resisted the saving of the lives of the starving population.

2. That he sympathized with the counter-revolutionary movement during the civil war and supported the counter-revolutionary forces abroad (in particular the political mani-

---

[22] *Izviestia,* No. 101, May 10, 1922.
[23] *Izviestia,* No. 100.
[24] Brekhonichev, *op. cit.,* p. 19; Spinka, p. 186 *f.*

festations of the Council of the Russian Church in Karlowitz [in Yugoslavia] in 1922).

The first accusation can be met with the following exhaustive and documental counter-proofs:

1. The appeal of the Patriarch to the Russian people entreating them to do their holy duty and save the starving population.

2. The following resolution of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee which was a direct consequence of the Patriarch's appeal:

"RESOLUTION OF THE ALL-RUSSIAN CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

"Taking in account the numerous petitions of various religious communities asking for permission to collect donations in favor of the starving population, The All-Russian Central Executive Committee hereby decrees:

"1. To allow to the religious administrations and separate religious communities to collect such donations;

"2. To propose to the Central Famine Relief Committee to come to an agreement with the religious communities as to the forms of collection and the ways of distribution, taking in account the wish of the donor.

"(Signed) Chairman of the A. R. C. E. C. Kalinin,
Secretary Enukidze.

"Moscow, Kreml, December 9, 1921."[25]

As to the appeal of the Patriarch dated February 28th and dealing with the spoliation of churches on the plea of "confiscating Church treasures in favor of the starving population," its aim was merely to demand some form of public control over the confiscation so as to prevent any acts of sacrilege. That appeal must be placed side by side with the declaration of the Patriarch himself which appeared in the official organ of the Soviet Government. It was headed "An interview with Patriarch Tikhon," and ran as follows:

"Remembering the commandment of Christ—'If thou hast two shirts, give one to thy neighbor'—the Church cannot remain indifferent

[25] Resolution of the Central Executive Committee, Dec. 12, 1921.

to the great sufferings of the starving people. To those words I referred in my appeal when I entreated to give away the Church treasures in favor of the starving population; this was before the Central Executive Committee passed its resolution to the effect of confiscating gold, silver, and precious stones belonging to the Church. In my appeal I enumerated those treasures: hangings, rings, bracelets given for the decoration of the ikons, various objects which are not used for the service, and old broken silver.

"I hope that the Commission which deals with the confiscation will set out to its work with proper care." [26]

---

[26] *Izviestia,* March 13, 1922.

PART III

Pseudo-Sobor, 1923

CHAPTER I. Pre-Sobor Machinations
Appendix A—A Communist View of The Living Church
Appendix B—An Orthodox Study of The Living Church

CHAPTER II. The Sobor of 1923
Appendix—The Sobor and Communism

CHAPTER III. The Sobor was Illegal

CHAPTER IV. The Sobor was Uncanonical

CHAPTER V. The Sobor was Never Recognized

CHAPTER I

Pre-Sobor Machinations

TWO opinions seem to have obtained among the Communistic in determining their attitude toward religion. The doctrinaire group, which adopted the Marxian aphorism, "Religion is opium for the people," combatted every form of belief, rationalistic as well as dogmatic. Another group worked upon the opportunist principle and endeavored to make use of group prejudices: killing as it were fire with fire. Protestantism and rationalism were encouraged as useful factors in wearing out the faith of the Church. Lenin himself encouraged the Baptist groups. Similar encouragement was given other groups, including the Seventh Day Adventists, Rashkovites, and Methodists. All this was done with the hope of creating a revolution (they called it "renovation") within the Church.

Until 1922 the doctrinaire policy was generally pursued. In that year the direction of the policy toward the Church seems to have been transferred from the Commissariat of Justice to the Tcheka, now known as the G. P. U., under one *Tertchoff* [Tetchkov], who was apparently commissioned to destroy the Church through underground methods. Was it a mere coincidence that the Living Church at this moment sprang into existence?

In September, 1922, a Soviet journal, *The Working Moscow,* reveals the real purpose of this movement.

"It [the Church] represents the last stronghold of the reactionary forces of the bourgeoisie. The end of the old medieval Church, the accomplice of monarchy and serfdom, is not very distant. We must

accelerate it and thus destroy the last counter-revolutionary organization on the territory of Soviet Russia.

"Of course, we cannot stop at that. We must go on fighting against religious prejudices and superstitions. Our aim is not to 'renovate' the Church, but to abolish it, to eradicate all religion. That aim can be achieved only when the society will be reorganized upon communistic principles. That takes a long time. The 'renovation of the Church,' which is being carried out at present by the progressive and democratic part of the clergy, as well as the laity, is but one of the stages on the way to the emancipation of the working masses of Russia from the aegis of the Church and from religious intoxication. It clears the way for us. We are consequently interested in the victory of the Living Church. But the old Church is far from being dead, whatever the people may say. It has got to be killed. An end must be put to the ecclesiastical counter-revolution."

The policy of the Soviet Government toward the Church was evidently borrowed from the Ottoman Empire. Create factional discords and smile while the proponents of the two factions quarrel is an effective, even if a rather Satanic policy. The Soviet agents found a willing tool in the Arch-priest Alexander Vvedensky, who later became Metropolitan Krutitsky (Vicar of Moscow). Vvedensky headed a group which began to organize itself immediately upon the election of the Patriarch. In 1922 they began their active attacks, publishing March 25th the famous "Letter of Twelve Priests,"[1] condemning the Patriarch for his attitude in respect to the surrender of the Church treasures. This letter is filled with pious pleas for the starving and strong condemnation of the Patriarch and his associates for withholding the treasures. Of course they make no reference to the more valuable and less useful and less sacred crown jewels.

This was followed, as we have seen, by the use of evidence offered at the trial of the Moscow clergy, as a means of inducing the Moscow authorities to place the Patriarch under

[1] This letter is long and rambling. It was first published in *Krasnaya Gazeta*, March 25th; republished in *Izviestia*, No. 71, March 29th. The whole movement resulting in the organization of the Living Church and the Sobor of 1923 was of a priestly (or presbyterian) character. Bishops and laity had but little place in the program.

arrest in the patriarchal quarters in Troitskoe podvor'e, thus preventing him from conducting the work of the chancery. Immediately thereafter Bishop Antonin, with representatives of the Petrograd clergy, including Vvedensky, issued a proclamation again rehearsing Tikhon's "crimes" in the usual form; and demanding immediate convoking of a Sobor, and retirement of the Patriarch from the activities of his office. To this the Patriarch replied, according to Vvedensky: "I have not sought the patriarchal office, and it weighs me down like a cross. I shall be glad if the future Sobor releases me from the patriarchate, and at present I shall retire from the administration of the Church, and shall transfer my authority to the eldest of the hierarchs." [2] The Patriarch immediately wrote to Kalinin acquainting him of his decision; and to the Metropolitan Agathangel of Yaroslav, appointing him as his substitute and asking him to come to Moscow at once.[3]

His enemies pressed Tikhon further, and May 18th they again visited him; and stressed the importance of opening the chancery at once. They then presented the following letter:

"*To His Holiness, the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon:*

"In view of the abdication of your holiness from the administration of the Church until the time of the calling of the Sobor, and of your transfer of authority to one of the elder hierarchs, the Church remains at present, as a matter of fact, without any kind of administration.

"That circumstance shows itself extraordinarily detrimental to the course of general Church life, and especially in Moscow, exciting thereby a great disturbance of minds.

"We, the undersigned, have petitioned the governmental authorities for permission to open the chancery of Your Holiness and start its functioning.

"By the present letter we filially ask for Your Holiness' blessing upon it, in order that the harmful cessation in the administration of Church affairs be terminated.

"Your substitute, then, upon his arrival, will immediately enter upon the discharge of his duties.

---

[2] *The Messenger of the Synod,* No. 3, 1925, p. 7.

[3] Full account of this is given in *The Living Church,* Moscow, May 23, 1922; not to be confused with the American journal of the same name.

"For these labors in the chancery, until such time as the final formation of the administration under the headship of your substitute be accomplished, we temporarily engage bishops now at liberty in Moscow.

"The unworthy servants of Your Holiness.

"ARCHPRIEST ALEXANDER VVEDENSKY,
"PRIEST EUGENE BELKOV,
"PRIEST SERGEI KALINOVSKY."[4]

After a lengthy discussion the Patriarch wrote this memorandum May 5-18, 1922:

"The persons named below are ordered to take over and transmit to the Most Reverend Metropolitan Agathangel, upon his arrival in Moscow, and with the assistance of Secretary Numerov, the synodical business; (administration of) the Moscow eparchy (to be entrusted) to the Most Reverend Innocent, Bishop of Klinsk, and before his arrival to the Most Reverend Leonid, Bishop of Vernensk, with the assistance of the departmental chief Nevsky.[5]

"For the hastening of my departure and the lodging in the patriarchal residence of the Most Reverend Agathangel, I beg that the Archimandrite Anempodist (Alexeev) be given leave.

"P. TIKHON."[6]

The Patriarch gives the following account:

"On May 18th of the previous year, during our imprisonment in the Troitskoe podvor'e, the priests Vvedensky, Belkov, and Kalinovsky (who but a short time previously had renounced holy orders) visited us, and under the pretext of caring for the welfare of the Church, presented us with a written statement, wherein they complained that in consequence of the existing circumstances, Church business remained unattended to. They begged us to intrust our chancery to them, in order that they might properly classify the correspondence received. Considering it a useful measure, we yielded to their solicitation and inscribed their petition with the following resolution:" (Then follows the resolution given above, but omitting the last unimportant paragraph.)

It will be seen that the whole transaction was based upon an explicit and implicit understanding that the appointment of these officers of the chancery was purely temporary. The

[4] Quoted by Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 201, from the official organ of the Holy Synod, *The Messenger*, No. 2, 1925, p. 18.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 18.

[6] The Public Proclamation, July 15, 1923.

Patriarch moved at once to the Donskoy Monastery where he remained until his death. May 20th, the radical group took over the patriarchal residence and its chancery; and immediately without patriarchal permission created themselves into a Provisional Supreme Church Administration.[7] The head of this council was Bishop Antonin, a persistent foe of the old Synod. Bishop Leonid was the only one of the Patriarch's nominees included in this body, and was appointed temporary Metropolitan of Moscow. This new group proclaimed themselves supreme head of the Church until a Sobor, soon to be called, created a permanent organization.

In the meantime, Metropolitan Agathangel, who was the Patriarch's appointee as his *locum tenens,* was refused necessary permission to leave Yaroslav. He was shortly afterward arrested on the usual charge of counter-revolutionary propaganda and exiled to the Narymsky territory. He was thus deprived of the exercise of his office, but before going into exile authorized each bishop to rule his diocese independently, in accordance with the canons of the Church, until either he or the Patriarch Tikhon were at liberty.

There is positive evidence that the Supreme Church Administration urged the Metropolitan Agathangel to join the revolutionary movement; and that his arrest and exile to Narym, possibly the most unhealthy place in Siberia, took place.

Bishop Innocent likewise found it most inconvenient to leave his diocese and could not proceed to Moscow. The Supreme Church Administration was now in full power. When questioned as to the need of patriarchal approval, Bishop Antonin naively stated, "He would not approve any of our reforms. Besides, since Patriarch Tikhon transmitted his authority to the Supreme Church Administration without any reservation, we have no necessity now to run after him to receive

[7] This group is called by various writers Provisional Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration, Higher Church Administration. Throughout this chapter the word "Provisional" will be omitted.

from him what he no longer possesses. We must definitely separate ourselves from the old ecclesiastical anti-social policy." [8]

Dr. Spinka sums up the steps by which the reformists created their organization as follows:

"The reformist group which had seized, in such an essentially revolutionary manner, the supreme power in the Church of Russia, soon organized itself. But even before its definite organization and adoption of a statement of its aims, the loosely coherent group began to voice its demands. As early as May 5th, in the very first number of the official organ of the group, called *The Living Church,* Krasnitsky expressed the elementary demands of his fellow-reformists by insisting upon a change of personnel in the highest offices, and upon the calling of a new national Sobor which would bring about pacification of the almost intolerable relations existing between the Church and the State, which, without exaggeration, could be termed a state of civil war. In the next number of this same publication, it was furthermore specified that the principle of separation of the Church from the State must be acknowledged as the *sine qua non* of the new ecclesiastical policy, and as a matter settled once for all. One is considerably surprised to read what the next Sobor was expected to accomplish; it was confidently affirmed by these reformists that the traditional immobility and the frigid, static conservatism of the Orthodox Church must give way to a new psychology—to that of a 'dynamic, vital, moving, creative progress from one attainment to another.' Secondly, the article declared that capitalism, from the Christian point of view, must be acknowledged as 'the great lie.' The divine worship must cease to be the soulless ceremonialism which it so long had been; the episcopal office must no longer stand for ecclesiastical despotism, and must transform itself wholly into a source of the mystical, spiritual power and divine grace vouchsafed to the Church through the episcopal succession. Finally, the very decrease in the ranks of the monks, occasioned by the confiscation of monastic property, should force upon the Church the necessity of admitting the 'white,' *i.e.,* married, clergy of the episcopal office, and thus acknowledging and reinstituting the early-Christian married episcopate. This article is probably the earliest public declaration of the general principles of the reformists, and it admittedly presents a bold program. The man courageous enough to outline such an objective was no other than Alexander Vvedensky." [9]

---

[8] *Izviestia,* No. 132, June 16, 1922.

[9] Spinka, *op. cit.,* pp. 210-11 *cf. The Living Church,* No. 1, May 1922, pp. 3, 4.

Their ideals were formally adopted as part of the program of the party, May 29, 1922. So far the Living Church was only a paper organization. In June it formally organized, with a central committee headed by the Archpriest Krasnitsky.

A deeper blow was struck by the All-Russian Conference of the Living Church, which met in Moscow August 6th to 16th, at which monks were declared a self-seeking group, and the whole monastic institution denounced.

The following important resolution was then passed:

> "1. That the Living Church group should demand at the next Sobor that Patriarch Tikhon be deprived of his clerical orders, because he bears the chief guilt for the present disorganization of the Church.
>
> "2. That the Supreme Church Administration be petitioned to order an immediate cessation of the mention of his name in the liturgical services in all parishes of the Russian Orthodox Church, as one who no longer holds office." [10]

All opponents of the Living Church were accounted guilty of insubordination and declared fitting objects of dire punishment. Vacancies in parishes caused by this action were to be filled when the local parish should "send a list of the new candidates for the parochial council of persons who have preserved canonical obedience (rule 56) to their priest. Persons manifesting opposition shall be handed over to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction and sentenced to ecclesiastical punishment to the extent of excommunication from the Church." [11]

Of primary importance was the action in respect to a married episcopate. Dr. Spinka, from his detached Protestant viewpoint, has been able to weigh the whole situation in unprejudiced balance. He states:

> "Since the whole Living Church movement represented a revolt of the white parochial clergy against the age-long preëmption of the hierarchal offices by the monks, with the consequent autocratic control of the white clergy by the black—or the regular clergy, as we would say in the West—it is no wonder that this problem of snatching the control from their hands greatly exercised the ingenuity of the 'whites.' They

[10] *The Living Church,* No. 8-9, 1922, p. 8.
[11] *The Living Church,* No. 8-9, 1922, p. 8.

felt, in the first place, that long-established usage and tradition was against them. Many Protestants fail to understand and appreciate the state of mind, bordering upon holy horror, with which most Russians would contemplate the possibility of married bishops. At no point is the conservative traditionalism of the average Russian more apparent than at this. All these difficulties were duly appreciated by the conference, which, therefore, was particularly concerned to prove its case: in long and learned disquisitions, the speakers presented voluble and tedious arguments, the burden of which was that the ancient apostolic Church possessed a married episcopate, and the same practice was long preserved in the Eastern Church. The conference finally voted that:

"1. On the basis of the fifth and fifty-first rules, the holy Apostles permit married presbyters to assume the episcopal office.

"2. On the basis of the practice of the ancient Church, of the third rule of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, and of the tenth rule of the Council of Ancyra, widowed priests are permitted to contract a second marriage and to retain their office.

"3. On the basis of the same rules, monastic clergy are permitted, upon abjuring their vows, to marry, still retaining their office." [12]

The Conference then created a permanent Supreme Church Administration and adjourned with one of their usual misleading addresses to the people. The closing paragraphs are typical:

"These sad manifestations caused the cup of patience of the true sons of the Russian Orthodox Church to overflow, and forced them to adopt revolutionary measures for renewing the Church on the basis of gospel principles and apostolic traditions. This great task is to be carried out by the impending All-Russian Local Sobor, the difficult task of preparing for which the Supreme Church Administration has taken upon itself.

"A large number of our best hierarchs, such as Metropolitan Sergei of Vladimir, Archbishop Evdokim of Nizhni Novgorod, Serafim of Kostroma, Tikhon of Voronezh, and many other hierarchs of our Church, hastened to confirm by their acknowledgment the complete canonicity and legality of the Supreme Church Administration, and now in every way coöperate in its difficult task with the party of the white Orthodox clergy, the Living Church." [13]

Defection immediately crept into the ranks of the Living

[12] *Ibid.* quoted by Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 220.
[13] Titlinov, *The New Church*, pp. 17-20.

Church. The more moderate party, which represented the demands of those who would appeal to the peasant group, found it impossible to stem the course of the more violent reformers. The leader of this movement was the stormy Bishop Antonin, the head of the Supreme Church Administration. He and his followers withdrew and formed the Churchly Regeneration. This organization strove to create an autonomous Church entirely free from the tyranny of the privileged monastic hierarchy. It looked for a complete democratization of the Church; but at the same time had a tender regard for the dogmatic and liturgical prejudices of the peasantry.

Another group centered around the famous (or infamous) Alexander Vvedensky, who was dissatisfied with the restraint of the Living Church along doctrinal lines. Vvedensky and his group separated and founded the Ancient Apostolic Church.

Notwithstanding these defections, everything was now ripe for convening the Sobor. There remained but the process of purgation or cleansing. V. Krasnitsky, head of the All-Russian Conference, states: "The second task is to draw into the Church the laity, but only such as are toiling and not exploiters or oppressors of others." [14]

Dr. Hecker, the vigorous advocate of the Living Church, describes this process thus:

> "The Living Church group feared a reaction. It knew that the old monks and bishops would not give up their privileges without a struggle and signs of its coming were at hand. Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd excommunicated the leaders of the progressive clergy, among them the priests, Vvedensky and Krasnitsky. Demonstrations against them were organized by the Conservatives, and they were branded as traitors and Bolsheviks. Fortunately there were among the old bishops a few who were sympathetic to the appeal of the Living Church, and these agreed to create a new hierarchy of white, *i.e.,* married, bishops, even before the meeting of the Sobor. On June 11, 1922, the Archbishops Leonid and Antonine ordained the first 'white' bishops, the Moscow priest, John Chancev, and the Petrograd priest, John Albinsky, and thus

[14] *Living Church,* No. 8-9, Sept. 6, 1922.

was broken the system of the 'black' episcopate which had existed in Russia for over a thousand years. Soon other 'white' bishops were ordained, and the progressives felt that they now could start a 'cleaning' of the Church from the reactionary episcopate and replace them by more trustworthy leaders. Scores of bishops were retired so that at the time of the first conference of the Living Church in August, 1922, it was reported that of ninety-seven diocesan bishops, thirty-seven had accepted the Living Church platform, thirty-six were against it, and twenty-four were undecided. Then and there it was decided to retire those who were against the Living Church reforms and call upon the undecided to make their choice.

"This first conference of the progressive Orthodox clergy, which met in Moscow on August 6, 1922, was undoubtedly an event of great historical importance. Never before in the thousand years of history of the Russian Orthodox Church had such a conference been called. There were present 150 priest delegates from every part of the great Soviet Republic. Most of these men had never seen each other and had never corresponded with each other, yet their common grievances and their common hopes gave them a sufficient tie of solidarity to commence far-reaching reforms in the administration of the Church. The chairman of the conference, the Leningrad priest, V. Krasnitzky, characterized this conference as the second stage in the revolutionary Church movement. He said:

" 'The first stage took place on May 14th of this year, when a small group of progressive priests appeared before the Patriarch and demanded of him that he, as a partisan of the old politics which had long been outlived, and as the one chiefly responsible for the ruin of the Church, should turn over his authority to a progressive group of clergymen, which he did by signing his abdication and transferring his powers to the Supreme Church Administration. The present conference is the second step along the way of the revolution in the Church. Our first task at this stage is to substitute for the old, reactionary, monastic episcopate a new progressive episcopate from among the ranks of the white, toiling clergy. . . . The second task is to draw into the administration of the Church the laity, but only such as are toiling and not exploiters and oppressors of others.'

"There was no dissenting voice in regard to these measures, and the cleaning in the Church was carried on in a most thorough manner, so that by the time of the Sobor there were, according to the statement of Patriarch Tikhon, only fifteen of his old bishops left who participated at the Sobor; in fact, eighty of the old bishops were dismissed.

"Simultaneously with the cleaning of the dioceses from the reac-

tionaries went on intense propaganda of the Living Church ideas and the forming of Living Church Unions of parish priests who were to educate the masses regarding the impending reforms and prepare the ground for election to the Sobor. Thus the first moves of the progressive clergy were to get control of the central and diocesan Church apparatus and remove those counter-revolutionary leaders who were the cause of mistrust on the part of the Government towards the Church and were causing much suffering to the rank and file of the parish clergy. All these reforms which were undertaken were ecclesiastical and political, not religious." [15]

Everything that could be done had been done, to prepare the ground for a Sobor that would exclude the Patriarch and his followers; and insure a gathering of those who through flattery of the Soviet Government and officials, and condemnation of all leaders in the ancient Church, would turn the Church government over to the several groups of radicals. With this specifically accomplished, the so-called Second Sobor was convoked.

---

[15] *Religion Under the Soviets,* Julius F. Hecker, pp. 89-91.

APPENDIX A

A Communist View of the Living Church

N. Stephanoff

THAT the Communists perceived the shallowness of the Living Church movement is illustrated in this "Summary of the Argument in the Living Church," a pamphlet written by N. Stephanoff, an ardent Communist leader, and published by the Moscow Committee of the Russian Communist Party in 1922 after the Living Church Coup:

"The Soviet Government destroyed and exterminated all the organizations of the landlords, noblemen, merchant corporations, and bourgeoisie, and all State and district Zemstvos and town councils, but the Church organization remained not only untouched since the time of the Romanoffs, but more than that, received in 1917 its czar and autocrat in electing the Patriarch Tikhon.

"The discipline of the Church can be compared only with the most severe discipline of an army. The Christian Church through its bishops, clergymen, and deacons has a large opportunity for propaganda, not only among the large groups present at sermons, but also for individual propaganda, through the permanent contacts with communicants. Our agitators and organizers have nothing of the kind because they have not the daily close connections with the people that the Church has. We must not forget that there exists yet a solid force, a mighty all-Russian organization, that will smash the head of the Soviet Government and Russian Communist party. The name of this organization is the Church.

"The Soviet Government had to decide whether it should endure further the destructive teachings among people that blindly follow their experienced leaders, or to stop at once the counter-revolutionary propaganda, manifesting in this fight ordinary boldness and energy. Unhesitatingly the Soviet Government chose the second method.

"One of the first problems of the Living Church was to find the most culpable and to make him responsible for all the spirit of exploitation of

the old Church. The search was not long. The answer was the learned monastic body. They were the people that furnished the Princes of the Church, but the Living Church did not realize the historical conditions of development of the Church. Any Church transforms itself always into a mighty exploiting apparatus. Any religion gets to be an instrument of the exploiting class.

"The most intelligent of the clergy and the most perspicacious ones understood that when the Soviet Government and Russian Communist Party would open the eyes of the people to the real reason of the strife with the party of Patriarch Tikhon, the masses would turn away, not only from the Church of Tikhon, but also later on from any religion. To avoid this, the Living Church program is to remove Tikhon and replace him.

"Now we must tell them we do not need any religion, neither yesterday's, nor today's, nor any religion generally. We are very glad that they began to review and revise the dogmas. This is the best method to emancipate the masses from religion and faith in the clergy and their sermons. Humanity can only gain from being delivered.

"The only reasonable act for self-preservation of the Church in Soviet Russia is to turn toward the Soviet Government. It is necessary for the Church itself and the professional advantage of the clergy requires it. That does not mean that the Living Church turned consciously to the Soviet Government. Some of the members could do it with a thorough knowledge, but others of them changed their color automatically because in existing conditions another color is not possible.

"We are glad that in this hostile camp the civil war has broken out. That is good because it proves our own fortification. It frees our own forces and relieves our situation. In the matter of the Living Church we must not have any self-deception, any emotion, any prostration. It is yet early to rest the wings. Although we obtained a great victory we must not forget we are not yet through and the Party will be obliged more than once to manifest its mighty force.

"We do not doubt that among the members of the Living Church will appear some simple-minded people who will imagine that scientific Communism is equivalent to the ideal of pure Christianity. The misfortune of the Russian clergy is that it is back several centuries. In these days 'religious communism' is an incident of little importance in the large movement under the hoisted scientific Communistic flag.

"How really naive the members of the Living Church are in their effort to save themselves by drowning the monastic body. Who of us does not know that the monastic body is the flesh and bone of the White (unmarried) clergy. Most of the fathers of the Living Church imagine

they will succeed in confining the revolutionary fire to the boundary of the Church. They imagine that casting out the monastic body from aboard the sinking ship will save themselves. This is a great error. From the Living Church itself will come a new group of people, who will be more far-seeing and more radical.

"The clergy is a profession and Church matters are their business just as a baker has his business. The clergy are obliged to adjust themselves to the consumer. Otherwise they might lose the customers. The leader of the Living Church, Krasnitsky, declared: 'One must not be under the restraint of canons. They are old-fashioned. Many of them are to be revoked.' The leaders of the Living Church feel that once starting in this direction one cannot know where he will have to stop. This is the reason why the Living Church does all it can to limit discussion by announcing as its program to recognize the Soviet Government, to cooperate with it, and urging that the source of all the Church misfortune to be the monastic order, that all will change when the Church will be managed by the White clergy.

"We are convinced that if the Living Church will remain thus obstinate, other groups more bold and decided will go forward and the Living Church will be thrown aside and passed by. It may be possible that one Church will fight against another, but we must take no one part. We must try to take all the advantage of this collusion for revolutionizing the masses. The Communistic Party must not criticize the old Church for fear of strengthening the Living Church and must not criticize the Living Church for fear of raising a more radical Church. The only manner of criticizing is to turn the masses from any Church, any clergy, and any religion.

"The Living Church remains always a Church with dogma that is in irreconcilable contradiction with science. The Communist Party is in irreconcilable animosity to any religion, any Church, and leads against them a merciless war of ideals for delivering the minds of the masses.

"One of the leaders of the Living Church says the Christian Church must be not only the inspiration of Communism but its Communism must be religious. V. N. Lvoff, member of the Government of Kerensky, active leader in the Church meeting in 1917 which elected Patriarch Tikhon and mobilized the Church to protect individual property, now preaches in favor of Communism. He states that Christian Communism has the same ideals and rushes with all his being to the Communist International. That is a lovely picture. Krasnitsky says it is necessary to draw to the Church as leaders of the Church community only the people that work themselves and are not exploiters. The Living Church has no religious program and only accomplishes personal arrangements for the benefit of the participants."

APPENDIX B

An Orthodox Study of the Living Church

THE following memorandum was prepared by Professor Troitsky for use in America. Most that he says is to be found in his longer study included in this volume. It seems best to insert the article in full in order to get a concise statement of his entire argument:

In the history of the Church there have been cases when Sobors not recognized at the beginning by a portion of the Church were subsequently recognized by the entire Church, thus acquiring incontestably general authoritativeness. Such, for example, is the history of the Second Ecumenical,[1] Antioch,[2] and Sardis[3] Councils. But the Sobor of 1923 is in an entirely different class, because:

1. The other councils were summoned by the legitimate church authority and were from the outset recognized by a section of the Church, whereas this assembly, called by a dissident organization, was denied recognition from the very start by every one of the Orthodox churches.[4]

2. This assemblage (1923), as we have seen already, was improper not only in its convocation, but also in its entire organization and activity.

3. The subsequent history of the Living Church does not give us the right to look upon that Church as upon the

---

[1] Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte,* II, 3, 29.

[2] Prof. M. Ostroumov, *Vvedenie v Pravoslavnoie Tzerkovnoie Pravo,* Kharkov, 1893, p. 189.

[3] *Ibid.,* pp. 192-193.

[4] Therefore, this Sobor was irregular at its very source, and Rule 19 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council provides that, according to Basilios the Great, "All that of which the beginning is impure is good for nothing."

Orthodox Russian Church and legitimate successor of that Church authority which existed before it in Russia.

4. The entry of two Orthodox patriarchates, later on, into relations with the Living Church, or Synodal Church, is to be explained by specific circumstances and does not give us the right to regard it as the Orthodox Church.

Since the first two points have already been elucidated by us, we shall dwell here on the last two.

That the Living Church and the Sobor of 1923 formed by it, and any of its institutions, cannot act as the legitimate heirs of the Church authority existing in Russia prior to these, is proved by:

(a) The fact that the Living Church not only failed to include the entire existing All-Russian Church, but even one-third of it.

According to figures collected by the President of the Papal Eastern Institute, Michel D'Herbigny, a man far better disposed to the Living Church than the Tikhonian Church, the overwhelming majority of the faithful remained also after the death of the Patriarch loyal to the "Tikhonian Church." "Among the popular masses," writes Father D'Herbigny, "I find a firm will, persistence in the Russian tradition, which is regarded as the perfect expression of the Divine will. In Moscow, in particular, the majority of believers attend the Tikhonian churches."[5] Referring to the Living Church as the "Synodal Church," he says that "The Synodics admit that the majority of the nation follows the Tikhonians, three-fourths, they say, while one Tikhonian bishop tells us that 35 per cent of the faithful are following the Synodics in the provinces and twenty per cent in Moscow."[6]

---

[5] *Tserkovnaia Zhizn v. Moskvie,* Paris, 1926, p. 40, *ff.; L'Aspect Religieux de Moscou,* pp. 211-212. Cf. Prof. Titlinov, "What Was Done for Church Peace?" where he says: "The Synodal leaders tried to influence the people, but without success, as the people blindly followed their leaders" (*i.e.,* those bishops who were loyal to Patriarch Tikhon).

[6] *Ibid.,* pp. 67 and 235. According to the official statistics of the Living Church, invariably exaggerated, it has 12,593 churches, 168 bishops, and 16,540 priests

The numerical weakness of the Living Church at the present time is witnessed also by a correspondence printed in the Warsaw journal, *Voskresnoie Chtenie,* November 14, 1926, No. 46. As we know, under Bolshevist decrees a "score"—*i.e.,* a written application signed by at least twenty persons—is necessary in order to have the right to form a parish. Says this article:

"Now the reformists (members of the Living Church) are petitioning to have the 'score' replaced by 'groups of authorized representatives' of two or three persons. The reason is that the unpopularity of the reformists among the believing populace in Russia is such that it makes difficult the collecting of even twenty signatures for an application to form a reformist parish."

Bishop James Cannon of Washington, writing in the New York *Times,* September 27, 1926 (*Vozrozhdenie,* No. 503, October 18, 1926), testifies:

"The Living Church, in spite of all the support given to it by the Soviet Government, has definitely failed, because the entire Russian nation, almost to a man, has remained faithful to the Patriarchal Church.[7] The representatives and not very numerous followers of the Living Church are seeking a way to the bosom of the true Church." (Re-translated from Russian and not an excerpt from *Times.*)

Even more sad is the condition of the other Churches, which, according to the report of Father D'Herbigny, have split off already from this "Synodal Church" itself. "The Red hierarchies," he says, "the Living Church, the Regeneration Church, the Ancient Apostolic Church—they all are dying or dead already,[8] Metropolitan Antoninus (the President of the Sobor of 1923) has displayed queer tendencies, and he has

---

and deacons (see *Viestnik Sviashchennago Sobora,* 1926, No. 7). The same figures are given also in the epistle from this Church to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, June 9, 1926, No. 444. But the total number of Russian churches was above 40,000.

[7] By the admission of the Reformists' own organ, the *Zhivaia Tserkov,* No. 3, p. 10, their Church was for a long time recognized by only two bishops. The other bishops were ordained by themselves.

[8] *Ibid.,* p. 196; *Russ.,* p. 21.

gone farther than the classical Protestantism and than the queerest sects that have been swarming in Russia from early times. Their very excesses have harmed the rebels. Their rivalries have killed them. The Living Church, the Regeneration Church, the Ancient Apostolic Church, the Free Church of the Workers, fought each other in 1923. And this ruined them. In 1925, in spite of the official protectors (the Bolshevist authorities), the Red hierarchies quickly shrank to nothing." Again, "the Living Church is agonizing, and the others do not feel any better." [9]

Meanwhile the Tikhonian, *i.e.,* Orthodox Church was busy, since the release of the Patriarch from confinement, restoring gradually order in the Church, so far as that may have been possible in view of the hostile attitude of the Soviet authorities, at first under the direct guidance of the Patriarch himself and later, after his death, under the administration of his lawful *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsy.[10] Since the latter's imprisonment, his place has been filled by Metropolitan Sergius (Starogorodski), a leading prelate, former rector of the Academy of Divinity and author of *O Spasenii (On Salvation),* a work that has been translated also into English. Both Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsy and Metropolitan Sergius are recognized by all the prelates of the Orthodox Church outside of Russia and, naturally, it is the Orthodox Russian Church headed by them, and not the "Synodal," "Living," "New" Church, as it is called by Professor Titlinoff, or any other newly formed Church, that is the legitimate heir or, more correctly speaking, custodian, of the rights of the more than nine centuries-old Russian Orthodox Church.[11]

---

[9] *Ibid.,* p. 216; *Russ.,* p. 45.

[10] The Act of his recognition, which was drawn up on April 12, 1925, bears the signatures of more than sixty bishops (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* November 1-15, 1925, No. 21-22).

[11] The fact that the Orthodox Russian Church, which is called the "Tikhonian" by its opponents, forms a well disciplined and organized community, is testified by its very opponents. An especially striking proof of this truth is found

(b) It is a mistake to imagine that the Living Church is a popular, democratic Church. On the contrary, it is an anti-democratic, caste, oligarchic, "popish" Church, founded by personally ambitious clergymen from the two capitals, who have grown rich, with the aid of the Soviet power; a Church they have organized so that all authority has fallen into their own hands.

We have already seen that this Church was originally founded by priests alone, and only afterwards did these invite some laymen and bishops, but to these they allowed only places of secondary importance. In their High Council organized at the Sobor of 1923 they allowed only five places out of eighteen to the bishops, and only one to the laity. Similarly, their parishes are headed by "collegiums" of four priests, one in minor orders, and one layman, presided over by a bishop who, however, enjoys no superiority (Titlinoff, *op. cit.*, p. 17). They also destroyed in the provinces the parish councils of the Tikhonian Church organized by the Sobor of 1917 on a perfectly democratic basis. This is admitted by Professor Titlinoff himself, saying:

"In advancing the white clergy, the Living Church shows a desire to exalt its position also in the parish, to emancipate it from dependence upon the parish councils. In the Living Church there is apparent even something like distrust of the laity, and it fears their influence upon Church affairs" (p. 13).[12] Titlinoff also testifies that the congress of representatives of the Living Church which met in August, 1922, resolved immediately to disband the (elective) parish councils,[13] which

---

in Prof. Titlinov's article, "What Was Done for Church Peace?" (*Viestnik,* No. 7, 1926), where we read that "the proclamation from Metropolitan Peter (July 28th) determined the whole line of action by the old churchmen" and we find him citing numerous instances of a steadfast defense of their own Orthodox Church by these old church people.

[12] *Novayia Tserkov,* Petrograd-Moscow, 1923.

[13] Violent fighting methods are not mere accidents in the practices of the Living Church. They form an organic part of its entire ideology, just as violence forms part of the ideology of the Bolshevist party. "The leaders of the (Living) Church," writes Titlinoff (p. 74), "recognize, as it were, tacitly, the revolutionary method of the Socialist *coup d'état,*" and he goes on to explain the far from complete success of the Christian Church during its history on the ground that "in the Christian social ideal there has been lacking from the outset the force of

were opposed to the reformist movement, and to form new ones, to be composed of individuals recommended (*i.e.,* simply appointed) by the superintending or head priest, on his own responsibility. This congress even accepted the proposition that only he could be a full-fledged lay member who will carry out in practical life the principles of the Living Church (p. 17). "Preponderance of class interests over ecclesiastico-idealistic, lack of tolerance for those who think differently, proneness to *violent methods,* fighting, and reformist zeal—all this shows through the decisions of the congress," frankly admits Professor Titlinoff himself.[14] "Worst of all, however, at the congress was definitely shown the original sin of the reformist movement—its remoteness from the masses of the Church.

"Notwithstanding its declarations about the toiling flock, the Living Church did not succeed in bringing under its influence the lay element.[15] And resolutions such as those about the dissolution of those parish councils which do not conform to the ideas of the Living Church (*i.e.,* simply a handful of ambition loving priests.—S. T.), the formation of councils composed of specially recommended members, the granting of the rights of Orthodox lay membership exclusively to the supporters of the Living Church, the elimination of the laity from any prominent part in the determination of the future Church administration—all this was bound still more to separate the new Church movement from the believing masses and make it altogether baseless" (p. 20).

And here we have the still more competent judgment of the head of the Living Church himself, Bishop Antoninus. As early as August, 1922, Bishop Antoninus, seeing the faults of the Living Church, separated from it with his followers and formed a separate group, the "Church Regeneration." In its "Program" we read: "This group separates itself from the

---

command" (p. 81); in other words, he considers it to have been a mistake on the part of the Saviour to have rejected the third offer of the Tempter (Mat. 4:8-10).

[14] *Ibid.,* p. 20.

[15] The attitude of the people toward the leaders of this Church has been thus described by Titlinoff: "The names of the leaders of the movement became odious. In the lower sections of the membership the indignation was such as to threaten some leaders with bodily violence. Vvedensky was hit with a stone on the head. And the others, too, would have been assaulted had they not been taken under the protection of the police. . . . Bishops and priests of the Living Church were unable to finish services in peace, or to show themselves at church and in the streets (*Novayia Tserkov,* p. 51).

narrowly professional Living Church and bases its strength, not upon caste isolation, but upon the solidarity of pastor and faithful flock. . . ." (Titlinoff, p. 23.) When the synod of the "Living Church" summoned him for trial he replied: "I do not recognize the competence of the synod and shall not submit to the synod. Already on the 29th of June I announced that I regard the activity of the synod exceedingly harmful to the Church. The Synodal Church I consider a purely popish and caste organization."

Similarly, according to the report published by the *Pravda,* the organ of the Russian Communist (Bolshevist) Party, of August 23, 1922, No. 188, the following statement was made at the Living Church congress in Moscow on August 12, 1922, by the priest Krylov:

> "The movement of the Living Church group unexpectedly takes the wrong path: (1) It is taking the form of a narrow caste movement, without the participation of the laity, (2) It rests upon a system of administrative coercion, including dismissal and banishment of the unfortunate victims, (3) In the place of the single Procurator General we had before, it has provided fifty-six new ones, in the persons of the diocesan representatives."

If by the admission of the leaders of the Living Church themselves this Church lacks support among the masses, how can we explain its still considerable success, as expressed in the control of about one-fourth of all the churches in Russia?

The only explanation is the support it receives from the Soviet authorities.[16] Of course, we cannot imagine that the Bolshevist power sympathizes with the Living Church as a religious organization. There is positively no such feeling, nor

---

[16] That the leaders of the Living Church resolved upon the usurpation of the authority for the reason that they were promised assistance by the Bolshevist authorities, one of these leaders, Professor Titlinoff, has the courage to confess, writing: "There remained only one thing now . . . to take into our own hands the church power, were it even in a revolutionary manner. . . . External conditions were favorable precisely to such a solution, since the revolutionary government itself was ready to support this church enterprise, even though it was strange to it" (*Novayia Tserkov,* p. 64).

can there be. Being atheistic, the Bolshevist power treats with equal animosity all religious organizations in general. But here conditions have so shaped themselves that up to a certain moment the paths of the Living Church run parallel with the paths of the Soviet policy, and therefore the Bolsheviks have rendered to this Church powerful support.

The Bolsheviks needed the Living Church not for its own sake, but as a convenient weapon to fight the Orthodox Church, inasmuch as the new Church, in order to gain its own ends, gladly yielded the religious and ecclesiastical interest for the benefit of the Bolshevist authority and carried strife and disorder into the midst of the Orthodox community itself.

"What has been the policy of the Soviet power with regard to the Church schism?" inquires Jacob Okunev, one of the leading Bolsheviks, in his brochure, *Smiena Viech v Tserkvi (Changing Mileposts in the Church),* which is a reprint of his lecture read at Kharkov on November 19, 1922, and was published by the *Proletarij* at Kharkov in 1923. We quote from p. 22:[17]

"The schism within the Church is advantageous to the Workers' and Peasants' government, as this leads to the weakening of its foes and the triumph of the revolution. . . . Were the Church to apply to the Soviet Government with a request that it help it to decompose, we should gladly, I think, help it. But if they were to ask us to help them unite, they would hardly find response among us."

In this way the Soviet authority helps the Living Church only as a weapon to disintegrate the Orthodox Church, and this as a weapon most convenient to it, inasmuch as the Living Church apes the slogans of the Soviet Government. "The Living Church," writes Professor Titlinoff, "in every way stresses its solidarity with the watchwords of the social liberation movement. *It may be that such emphasizing is due to tactical considerations,* but it has become so characteristic of the Liv-

[17] See article by Paul Bertel in the *Echo de Paris,* 1923, on Archbishop Cieplak: "We want to kill the movement of the people toward religion and we have already achieved satisfactory results." And a Bolshevist commissar said: "The Orthodox Church has ceased to be a unit" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 9-10, p. 9).

ing Church that its enemies have commenced to call it simply the 'Soviet Church' " (p. 14). Being dependent upon the Living Church, Professor Titlinoff merely admits the possibility that the Bolshevist watchwords have been adopted by the Living Church "from tactical considerations," *i.e.,* to put it plainly, to be able, with the aid of the Bolshevist powers, to suppress the "Tikhonian Church." But the Bolsheviks themselves write more candidly, and even with downright contemptuousness, that they do not trust the sincerity of the Living Church.

"It has issued such a fine declaration," says Okunev in his pamphlet referred to previously, "that some unenlightened workingman may really decide that it is certain that Communists themselves must have donned the priestly vestments and are issuing, in the form of an ecclesiastical declaration, a Communist appeal. . . . This is mere painting in revolutionary paint. The clergy have repainted and clothed themselves with revolutionary, red vestments, for the sake of their own hide" (pp. 20-21). Still, this contempt for the Living Churchmen, as their voluntary flunkeys, does not prevent the Bolsheviks from aiding the Church in its struggle against the "Tikhonian" Church, which is guided by really religious considerations.

This aid is expressed chiefly in the fact that the Bolshevist authority places at their disposal its external power (*bracchium saeculare*), whenever the agents of the Living Church bring into play forcible measures against the representatives of the Orthodox Church. "The leaders of this tendency (Living Church)," cautiously admits Professor Titlinoff, "had no particular scruples as to the means with which to carry through their plans, and they did not disdain methods that were not in keeping with the spirit of orthodox brotherhood, and which were inevitably bound to embitter the opposite camp," and then he goes on to recall the shutting down of all city monasteries, the dismissal of all the monks and prelates who came out against the Living Church, the banishment of

bishops from their dioceses, the closing of the parish councils,[18] and other such acts (pp. 15-16).[19]

The fact is that all these coercive measures, against the wishes of an overwhelming majority of the population, were taken by the agents of the Living Church with the military aid of the Bolsheviks and very often led to sanguinary clashes. This is why the people have gained the conviction that the Living Church is not only a "Soviet Church," as admitted by Professor Titlinoff (p. 14), but even an organ of the most loathsome Bolshevist political espionage organization, the "Extraordinary Commission" (*Cheka*), subsequently renamed the "Main Political Administration" (G.P.U.). Thus, we find a direct denunciation of the Patriarch, with consequences leading to capital punishment, contained in a pamphlet written by the most prominent figure in the Living Church, Archpriest Vvedenski, and published under the title of *Tserkov Patriarcha Tikhona* (Patriarch Tikhon's Church) by the Second Typography of the Moscow Union of Consumers' Societies, 1923.

The character of a similar denunciation to the temporal powers may be found also in the address of the Third Sobor of the Living Church to the "Workers' and Peasants' Government," accusing the "Tikhonites" of attempting to use the Church "as an anti-Soviet force" (*Tserkovnoie Obnovlenie,* November 25, 1925. No. 14, p. 111),[20] but especially in the speech delivered to the Sobor by Vvedenski (pp. 112-116), accusing, among other things, the Tikhonian bishops of rela-

---

[18] *Cf.* Protocol of meeting of the Living Church Sobor on October 3, 1925, reading: "Lay member Kharitonov (from Briansk) proposes to petition the Government that the organs of the civil authority should demand a new registration of church communities and that they should register only those that are under the control of the synod," *i.e.,* in plain language, should close down all parishes of the "Tikhonian" Church (*Viestnik,* 1926, No. 6, p. 13).

[19] See also *Izviestia,* 1922, No. 275, about assistance rendered by the Soviet authorities to the Living Church in fighting the parish councils.

[20] See also the "Circular from the Living Church" appearing in the *Viestnik* (1924, No. 1, p. 16), which says that Patriarch Tikhon is consolidating reactionary social forces "for another reactionary revolt and outbreak."

tions with England designed to overthrow the Soviet power.[21]

Here follows a series of newspaper reports showing that the Living, or Synodal, Church has constantly used in its struggle against the Orthodox Church, and is still using, the force lent by the Bolshevist authorities:

1. *Krasnitski,* at the congress of the Living Church, proposes that those bishops of the Orthodox Church which do not submit to the synod shall be denounced to the Soviet Central Executive Committee and brought to trial (*Rul,* December 31, 1922, No. 635).

2. Vvedenski (Metropolitan of the Synodal Church), quite openly points out all his opponents to the G. P. U., and they are then arrested, thus facilitating for him the work of his Church reform; he summons all kinds of Church conventions and conferences, with the aid of the Soviet organization, and he travels about in government automobiles. The Synodal Church is the Government Church, enjoying the most obvious and undisguised patronage of the powers that be (From the Socialist newspaper *Volia Rossii,* October 4, 1922, 1075, article entitled *Tserkovnaia Neuriaditsa*).

3. An interview with the head of the Living Church, Antoninus: "I am receiving," says Antoninus, "from various places complaints about the Living Church and about its representatives, who by their threats and acts of violence, arrests, and banishments, provoke great irritation at it" (The official newspaper of the Soviet Government, the *Izviestia,* 1922, No. 217).

4. Kalinin (head of the Soviet Government) proposed to Antoninus to organize a new Supreme Church Administration on a coalition basis. . . . At Moscow, arrests are taking place according to lists compiled by Vvedenski and Krasnitski (*Novoie Vremia,* December 6, 1922).

5. The Living Church is a Soviet church, something that kills all confidence in it (*Dni,* March 3, 1923, No. 104).

6. The Living Church is the ecclesiastical department of the G. P. U. As a general rule, the weeding out process among the clergy is performed by the G. P. U. on reports from the Supreme Church Administration. . . . Clergymen are not merely removed, but also exiled to remote regions (*Poslednia Novosti,* January 30, 1923).

---

[21] See also the Epistle of the reformist Sobor of 1925, where the Orthodox are accused of being "even today opposed to the existing governmental authority" (*Viestnik* of the Sobor, 1926, No. 6, p. 32). In this connection, we may point out a small, but very characteristic detail: in all printed materials of the Living Church, the name of the Deity is always printed with a small letter, while the designation of the Bolshevist authority is always in capitals.

7. The Living Church has been turned into another Commissariat (*Rul,* January 20, 1923, No. 651).

8. The leaders of the Living Church were waiting for the proclamation to confiscate the churches from the old parish councils (*Rul,* January 20, 1923).

There might have been suspicion regarding the reliability of these reports because they happen to be culled from the anti-Bolshevist émigré press, were it not for the fact that, in the first place, we find similar reports also in the publications of the Living Church itself and, in the second place, this hostility is explained precisely because that Church has become the handmaiden of the Bolshevist Soviet Government.

The supporters of the Living, or Synodal, Church usually refer to the recognition accorded them by the Constantinople Patriarch recently, as well as by the Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem.[22] But in this instance they are guilty of quite a few transgressions against truth, both in the exposition of facts and in their interpretation.

a. Patriarch Gregory of Antioch has thus far been utterly opposed to the Synodal Church, as a schismatic association, and the conclusion that he has recognized this Church is made only on the ground that his representative was present at one of the assemblages of this Church. But such presence was not an act of recognition of the Synodal Church, and the Patriarch did not approve of the action of his representative. The same applies to Patriarch Photius of Alexandria.

b. The Patriarch of Constantinople and Patriarch Damianos of Jerusalem actually did enter into correspondence with representatives of the Synodal Church. But neither has

---

[22] We cannot help calling attention to one inner contradiction betrayed by the leaders of the Living Church. While they frown upon the authority of a patriarchate, and after they have abolished such authority in their own church, they attempt at the same time to bolster up their case on the ground of patriarchal recognition. This self-contradiction becomes simply farcical when we read the organ of the Ukrainian Living Church, *Golos* (Kharkov, January, 1925, No. 1-2), where, on page 15, referring to the Patriarch of Constantinople, the patriarchal authority is praised highly, while the same authority for Russia, on page 16, is abused in every possible way.

this fact the implication of recognition by them of this Church as the rightful successor of the former Church authority. The Constantinople Patriarch views the dispute between the Tikhonian and Synodal Church as still being *in processu,* and for this reason never denied the legal powers of Patriarch Tikhon and his loyal hierarchy. Thus, for instance, in the epistle from the Ecumenical Patriarch Basilios III addressed to Metropolitan Anthony, July 19, 1926, No. 1413, which the present writer has read in its Greek original, mention is made of an invitation extended to the patriarchal *locum tenens,* Peter, and his loyal clergy to attend the Ecumenical Council.

On the other hand, again, at no place do we find the patriarchs recognizing as proper the organization of the Synodal [Living] Church. For instance, in an epistle from the same patriarch to the Synod of the Living Church (see the official organ of this Church, the *Tserkovnoie Obnovlenie,* November 25, 1925, No. 14) we find, *not recognition, but exhortation* "to observe strictly the canonical rules" and to "aid towards the earliest and completest removal of the grievous division," *i.e.,* to submit to the legitimate authority of the patriarchal *locum tenens.* Therefore, the fact of the patriarchs entering into correspondence with the Synodal [Living] Church is merely in the nature of a tactical measure designed to help pacify the troubled Russian Church.

But then, even this step by these patriarchs cannot be regarded as correct from the canonical standpoint, and they were for this reason condemned by Patriarch Tikhon. At sessions of the Constantinople Synod held on January 1st, April 17th and 30th, and May 6th, 1924, it had been decided to send to Russia a Church mission empowered to study conditions and act on the spot, on the basis and within the limits of an instruction which, among other things, recommended to Patriarch Tikhon, "for the sake of unity with the dissidents and for the sake of the flock, to offer himself as a sacrifice, withdrawing immediately from the government of the Church." But these attempts at an unlawful intervention in the internal af-

fairs of the Russian Church were met with a firm refusal by Patriarch Tikhon. In his epistle addressed to the Ecumenical Patriarch, Gregory VII,[23] Patriarch Tikhon expresses his surprise that the Constantinople patriarch, acting "without any preliminary communication with us, as the legitimate representative and primate of the entire Russian Orthodox Church, should intervene in the internal affairs and business of the autocephalous Russian Church. The Sacred Church Councils (See Rules 2 and 3 of the Second Ecumenical Council, and others) have always conceded, and concede today the primacy of the Bishop of Constantinople, compared with other autocephalous Church heads, in point of honor, but not authority.[24] Nor must we forget that other rule which provides that bishops must not, unless invited, trespass beyond the boundaries of their own province either for the imposition of hands or any other ecclesiastical disposition. And therefore any attempt by any commission to act without communicating with me, in my capacity of sole legitimate and orthodox Primate of the Russian Orthodox Church, and without my knowledge, will be rejected by the Russian Orthodox people and will introduce still greater unrest and dissent instead of peace" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* April 1-15, 1925, No. 7-8, p. 3).

There is still another circumstance which affords good reason to attach no importance to this correspondence between the Patriarchs and the Synodal [Living] Church. The importance of the Patriarch of Constantinople, who at one time held the leading position in the Orthodox world, has now dwindled to practically nothing, as the result of historical events.

Today, his entire flock is hardly in excess of a few score thousand members, and these living under the yoke of the

[23] The authenticity of this epistle has been admitted also by the Living Church (see *Golos Pravoslavnoj Ukrainy,* January, 1925, No. 1-2, p. 12).

[24] That the Patriarch of Constantinople has no special powers as compared with the primates of the other autocephalous churches is shown in my article, on the jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarch, in *Russkaya Mysl,* 1923, VI-VIII, p. 354.

hostile Turkish rule. In these circumstances, the rather numerous Greek priesthood of the Constantinople patriarchal see proves to be extremely responsive to all manner of political as well as economic influences from the outside.[25] And we possess incontestable proof that the attitudinal change in the Patriarch toward the Synodal Church, in the direction of excessive condescension, has been influenced by the hope of obtaining, through the Soviet-favored Synodal Church, political as well as pecuniary support from the Soviet power. The epistle from the Living Church Synod of December 11, 1924, concludes with a promise to help those Churches morally and, in particular, materially, to cover their losses.

Next, in the archives of the Supreme Church Administration at Karlowitz, we have on file a report from Rassim Bey, the Chief of the Turkish Political Section for Russian Affairs, dated May 28, 1924, sub No. 26, stating that during the domiciliary search made by the Turkish police authorities at the house of the Constantinople representative of the Synodal Church, Attorney Vladimir Sergeievich Polianski, documents had been discovered to prove that Polianski himself was secretly in the service of Petemkin, the Bolshevist Consul at Constantinople, with a salary of 800 pounds (Turkish) per month; also, that the Patriarchate Secretary, Papa-Iohannu, was receiving through Polianski 75 pounds a month from the Bolsheviks, signing the receipts as Gerassimoff; that the scheme to send the commission we have mentioned on p. 52, from Patriarch Gregory VII to Moscow for the purpose of overthrowing Patriarch Tikhon, had been worked out by the Bolsheviks, and in return for this the promise had been given to the Patriarchate that Moscow would support it at Angora in the matter of preserving the Ecumenical Patriarchate at Constantinople and in the question of permitting the Patriarch to continue to exercise certain political functions.

---

[25] Metropolitan Andreas Sheptitzky, the noted Uniat prelate, declared on August 14, 1914, to Emperor Francis Joseph that "the Eastern Patriarchs can be bribed with money" (see *Kievlianin,* October 14, 1919).

These accidentally exposed facts afford reason to see also in the changed attitude of some Eastern Patriarchs with respect to the Synodal [Living] Church nothing but the success of Bolshevist diplomacy and Bolshevist gold.

But even if some of the Eastern Patriarchs were to recognize the Living Church voluntarily and decisively, it would by no means make this Church the legal heir of the Orthodox Russian Church. The Canons prescribe, in case of disagreement among bishops, that the majority shall rule (First Ecumenical Council, Rule 6; Antioch, Rule 19); but all the Eastern Patriarchal sees combined form only an insignificant part of the Orthodox Church. As far as the number of their population is concerned, all four Patriarchal provinces do not make up even a single Russian diocese,[26] and we saw already that even according to the statistics of the Living Church people themselves, the Tikhonian Church includes at the very least three-quarters of the total Orthodox population of Russia, and, moreover, the patriarchates of Serbia, Rumania, Antioch, and the Churches of Poland, Cyprus, and Greece are unconditionally opposed to the "Synodal Church" [or Living Church].

[26] In the latest issue of the *Pravoslavnoie Tserkovnoie Pravo* by Nikodim Milosh, Belgrad, 1926, we find these figures: Patriarchate of Alexandria, 10,000 souls (p. 808); Antioch, 30,000 (p. 812); Jerusalem, 15,000 (p. 813); and of Constantinople it says that it "actually does not exist now" (p. 804). We have reason to assert that the actual Orthodox population figures of the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchates are larger, but in any case, the population of all the four Eastern Patriarchates combined does not exceed 600,000, that is, it is only about 1/200 of the total Orthodox world. That the attitude of the Eastern Patriarchs toward the Living Church cannot be taken very seriously is admitted by the leaders of that very church. Writes Titlinov: "These are the representatives of insignificant churches in the territory of the Moslem countries who at present have their orientation on Soviet Russia" (*Novaia Tserkov*, p. 79).

CHAPTER II

THE SOBOR OF 1923

WHEN the process of "purgation or cleansing" within the Russian Church seemed complete, the long promised Sobor was summoned "by the canonically legal authority" (*i.e.*, the usurping Supreme Church Administration). The first summons was for February 1, 1923. Later the opening was postponed until April 29th. In all, four hundred and thirty delegates were in attendance. Of this number an absolute majority of two hundred and fifty delegates belonged to the Living Church. The Ancient Apostolic Church of Alexander Vvedensky sent one hundred and ten delegates. The Churchly Regeneration, following Metropolitan Antonin, was represented by twenty-five members.[1] Thus we find three hundred and eighty-five represented the "reforming" movements. They immediately convened and passed a fulsome resolution upon the Soviet Government and Lenin, and proceeded at once to questions relating to the Patriarchate. The primary resolution recommending the depriva-

---

[1] The following statement from the Protocols (Record) of the Session to the Sobor Session 1, May 2d, is an official contradiction to the claim that the Sobor was intended for other than that of the renovated groups.

First gathering on affairs was appointed for Wednesday on the middle of Pentecost, *i.e.,* May 2, 1923, to take place in the building of the former Seminary No. 3.

The Sobor was opened at 7:30 p.m. in the building of the former Theological Seminary by the President of the Supreme Church Administration, Metropolitan Antonin, with the prayer, "Christ is risen and today the grace of God hath gathered us." In the name of the meeting of three united renovated groups, *The Living Church, Union of the Ancient Apostolic Church Communion, and the Union of Church Regeneration,* Metropolitan Peter of Siberia is proposed as a business president, and as honorary president, Metropolitan Antonin of Moscow.

tion of the Patriarch contained the signatures of but forty-four of the sixty-six bishops. After Vvedensky had made an impassioned speech, Metropolitan Antonin offered the following resolution:

"Having heard the report of Archpriest A. Vvedensky, the All-Russian Local Sobor of the Orthodox Church witnesses before the Church and before all mankind that at present the world has become divided into two classes: capitalists-exploiters, and the proletariat, by whose toil and blood the capitalistic world builds its prosperity. No one in the world but the Soviet Government of Russia has undertaken a struggle against this social evil. Christians cannot remain indifferent spectators of that struggle. The Sobor declares capitalism to be a mortal sin, and the fight against it to be sacred for Christians. The Sobor sees in the Soviet Government the world leader toward fraternity, equality, and international peace. The Sobor denounces the international and domestic counter-revolution, and condemns it with all its religious and moral authority.

"The Sobor calls upon every honest Christian citizen of Russia to go forth to battle, in united front, under the guidance of the Soviet Government, against the world-evil of social wrong.

"The Holy Sobor of 1923 of the Orthodox Church, having deliberated on the condition of the Church during the time of the revolution, has resolved:

"1. Beginning with the summer of 1917, responsible leaders of the Church assumed a definitely counter-revolutionary point of view. The Church must reëstablish the unity of the tsarist Russia—such was the slogan which the Church chose to follow (having been so closely bound with tsarism prior to the revolution). The Sobor of 1917, composed largely of representatives of the reactionary clergy as well as of the high nobility, property owners, and members of reactionary political parties, became at the very outset a definitely political counter-revolutionary gathering which merely covered all these actions with the name of Christ the Saviour. The Sobor fought against the revolution. It did not recognize even the Provisional Government, and after October this struggle assumed perfectly incredible proportions.

"After the meeting of the Sobor, Patriarch Tikhon continued this counter-revolutionary activity. He became the leader and standard-bearer of all opponents of the Soviet Government. He drove the Church into the counter-revolutionary struggle.

"The Holy Sobor of 1923 of the Orthodox Church condemns the counter-revolutionary struggle and its methods, which are the methods

of man-hatred. Especially does the Sobor of 1923 deplore the anathematization of the Soviet Government and of all who recognize it. The Sobor declares this anathematizing to have no force.

"2. The Sobor of 1923 condemns all those who have followed this path and persuaded others to follow them. And this applies, first of all, to the responsible leader of our Church life, Patriarch Tikhon. Whereas Patriarch Tikhon served the counter-revolution instead of sincerely serving Christ, and since he is the person who was supposed to direct properly all ecclesiastical life, but as on the contrary he led astray the broad masses of the Church, the Sobor regards Tikhon as an apostate from the original commands of Christ and a traitor to the Church. On the basis of the canons of the Church, it hereby declares him to be DEPRIVED OF HIS CLERICAL ORDERS AND MONKHOOD AND RELEGATED TO HIS ORIGINAL LAY CONDITION.

"HEREAFTER PATRIARCH TIKHON IS LAYMAN BASIL BELAVIN."[2]

The presence of the accused and his right of protest and defense were trivial in the eyes of this democratic Sobor.

We must remember that the Sobor was vigorously opposed to the monastic clergy. Hence the next logical step was to do away with the necessity of calling upon the monasteries for the episcopate. A fitting resolution was in the hands of the episcopal members of the Living Church, reading:

"The practice of the Russian Church hitherto followed the rule of having an unmarried, and specifically a monastic, episcopacy. During the present revolutionary times a married episcopacy was admitted. The Supreme Church Administration approved of married bishops in Voronezh, and the Episcopal Advisory Council of the Sobor, in its session of May 1, 1923, admitted into canonical fellowship the married episcopate of Siberia. At present, under the urgent demands of life, the Episcopal Advisory Council of the Sobor rules: not to regard the married estate as a bar to the episcopal office, and beginning with May 3, 1923, to admit to it the single, unmarried, as well as the married candidates."[3]

In the final resolution, an effort was made to give the de-

---

[2] *Acts of the Second All-Russian Sobor of the Orthodox Church,* published May 2, 1923, pp. 6-8. This is the official report. It is also contained in the report of the trial of Kedrovsky vs. Platon.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 8.

cree an historical and canonical background. It was passed in this form:

"Following the plain and immutable witness of the Holy Writ (I Timothy 3:2-4; Titus 1:6-9), which is the fundamental source of the Christian faith and piety, and in pursuance of the findings of the most ancient memorials of Christian literature, the canons of the holy Apostles (rules 5, 40, 51) and the decisions of the ecumenical and local Sobor (First Ecumenical Council, 17; Carthaginian Council, 4, rules 3, 25, 71; Fourth Ecumenical Council, rule 4); also taking into consideration the practice of the Eastern Churches and the Greek Church, in which, as late as the twelfth century, the married episcopacy was of common occurrence; and finally, taking heed of the contemporary situation in the Russian Church, which the monastic episcopate, with a few exceptions, showed itself unsuited to cope with, the Second All-Russian Local Sobor deems it absolutely necessary to admit to the episcopal office the white, married clergy equally with unmarried persons."[4]

Along the same lines resolutions were passed permitting the second marriage of priests and permitting priests to marry widows and divorcees. Of less importance were resolutions regarding the use of relics and saints, the closing of monasteries, the adoption of the Gregorian calendar.

The Supreme Church Administration was continued with proportionate representatives of each of the three major groups. The so-called second Sobor adjourned May 9th, leaving behind it a legend of ruthlessness towards sacred persons and things, disregard of tradition, and a supine and pitiful picture of a Church Council pleading for recognition by a professedly non-religious government.

In the whole consideration of the validity of this Sobor, it is necessary to inquire by what authority a self-organized group can usurp the prerogatives of an historic Church, which has never passed out of existence, and which, despite persecution, still continues to function, and whose continuous existence is recognized by the permanent organization growing out of that Sobor. In the following pages it will be seen that the Holy Synod created by this pseudo-Sobor has made frequent

[4] *Ibid.*

efforts to obtain recognition by the members of the old Church who had remained loyal to the Patriarch. Evidence is abundant that at the time the Sobor was called, however, its conveners had planned to become the legal successors of the old Russian Church, taking precaution to preclude the possibility of becoming its moral successor. We have already shown the thoroughness of the system of purgation, which for the time being had the sanction of the Soviet Government. Eye witnesses have described to the author the manner in which unimportant followers of the Patriarch were forced to attend the Sobor, in order that the gathering might present to the world the appearance of comprehensiveness.

It is true that for a few months the Sobor and the permanent organization created by it had acted with the unofficial approval of the government. It will be shown later that whatever strength this new organization gathered from this encouragement was soon negatived by the release of the Patriarch and his resumption of leadership of the old Church organization, thereafter described as the Patriarchal Church or Patriarchal Synod. It would seem as though the servility of the Sobor and its Holy Synod to the Soviets which caused it to be considered a useful tool, at the same time was used as an object of derision.

From this environment, the Holy Synod of this new body sent to America as its accredited agent, and claimant to the Archiepiscopate, one John Kedrovsky. They seem to have been unable to provide Kedrovsky with credentials either for themselves as a licensed organization or Kedrovsky as their agent. The only credentials therefore that Kedrovsky could bring were his diploma and a power of attorney signed by the individual members of the synod, acting, as the document states, as an unincorporated body. This document does not even carry the certification of a Russian notary, but that of an American Commissioner of Deeds. The whole procedure is a sad travesty and betrays the lack of respect for the Sobor and its synod in Russia.

In the following chapters we will consider the regularity of this Sobor as a convention called illegally, uncanonically, and unrecognized by the Orthodox Church. In a way this study of the Sobor is purely academic. The return of the Patriarch and continued activities of the Sacred Synod offer sufficient evidence that the Patriarchal Church had not merged with the other religious groups forming the Sobor of 1923. The deposition of the Patriarch was purely farcical. There was no trial in which the defense could state its case. Even had the trial been conducted in a regular manner, the Sobor had no more authority to try the Patriarch of an historic Church than the Confederacy in America to try the President of the United States. In the end, let us repeat, the Soviet Government removed the only possible justification for the Sobor. The Patriarch was released from prison untried and unconvicted; and under him the old Church continued to function.

APPENDIX

The Sobor and Communism

THE following extracts are from the official report of the Sobor of 1923 offered by John S. Kedrovsky as evidence, and printed in the official report of the trial in 1924:

"A word of gratitude and a warm compliment must be expressed by us to the only power in the world that makes (or shows), not believing, the act of love which we, believing, do not fulfil, and also to the leader of Soviet Russia, V. U. Lenin, who must be dear to the Church people, as a citizen of the Republic."

Address to the Government

In the name of the Union of the Ancient Apostolic Church Commune, Archpriest Vvedensky proposes to accept the greetings in the following form: The Second Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church commenced its work; sends a word of gratitude to the Supreme Civil Commissariat for the permit to let the chosen sons of the country assemble so that they may consider material questions. Together with that gratitude, the Sobor sends its greetings to the Supreme Organ of Labor and Peasant Authorities, and also the world's leader, V. U. Lenin.

The October revolt brings into life great beginnings of equality in labor contained in the Christian teachings; in the whole world the mighty are oppressing the weak. Only in Soviet Russia began the struggle against that social wrong. The Sobor thinks that every respectable Christian must stand among those strugglers for the truth of mankind, and through the entire world bring into life the principles of the October revolution.

The Sobor wishes Vladimir Illych Lenin quick recovery, so that he may again stand as a leader of struggles for a great social truth. The greetings to the authorities, the Sobor accepted unanimously. In the name of the Moscow Metropolite Diocese, Metropolitan Antonin sends the civil authorities greetings.

What is Soviet authority? Its substance. Its struggle with the world's evil. Its relation to religion (principle of non-interference in religious life. Decree of separation of Church and State, principle of religious freedom, religious and anti-religious propaganda). Soviet power is the only one in the world of all time of the existence of mankind, to fight actually for good and equality. They say that it does it with governmental methods, but it is a government, not a Church. The Church we do not pervert into a Communistic Church. Nobody needs a Red Church. But the Church sees in the Soviet authority, authority which is struggling for the ideals of God's Kingdom. Therefore, every member of the Church should be not only loyal to the authority, but actually help in the struggle with the world's evil.

After Antonin's speech and announcement of the ordination of the episcopal council the president brought up to a vote the following resolutions: After hearing the report of Archbishop A. Vvedensky, All-Russian Local Sobor of the Orthodox Church testifies before the face of the Church and all mankind that at present the world has divided itself into two classes: capitalist-exploiters and proletariat, with whose labor and blood the capitalistic world is building its welfare.

Sobor is fighting with the Revolution. It does not recognize even the Temporary Government, *i.e.,* Kerensky and others before him, and after October the battle came to entirely improbable measures.

Workers of the renovating Church movement disrupted with the counter-revolutionaries and by it earned the disapproval of all reactionary Churchmen. The Holy Sobor announces all those measures of disapproval powerless, and on the contrary, the Sobor blesses the courage of those people and their loyalty to the Church, which it grabbed out of the hands of the counter-revolutionaries, and gave it into the hands of the Saviour.

The Holy Sobor convokes all Church people to cast away all attempts to use the Church as a tool in the earthly political accounts. The Church belongs to God and Him only it should serve. There should be no place in the Church for a counter-revolution. Soviet authority is no persecutor of the Church. According to the Constitution of the Soviet State, the right of freedom of conscience is left to all citizens. The Decree of the Separation of Church and State secures that freedom. Religious freedom of propaganda equally with the freedom of anti-religious propaganda gives the faithful the opportunity ideally to withstand the valuation of their religious convictions. Therefore, the Church people should not see in the Soviet authority, authority of anti-Christ, but, on the contrary, the Sobor calls attention that the Soviet authority with its governmental methods is the only one in the world which is

going to realize the ideals of God's Kingdom. Therefore, every faithful Churchman should be not only a respectable citizen, but should fight with all his power, together with the Soviet authority, to realize on earth ideals of God's Kingdom.

Condemning the Patriarch Tikhon as not a Church leader, but a contra-revolutionist, the Sobor acknowledges that the very act of the restoration of the patriarchate was an act of definite political counter-revolution.

The ancient Church knew no patriarchate, but was ruled by a Sobor; therefore the Holy Sobor hereby changes the restoration of the patriarchate, and henceforth is ruled by the Sobor.

[Note: The author has noted the confusion of titles, etc.; but inasmuch as this is a copy of an official document he has not felt free to edit it.]

CHAPTER III

The Sobor of 1923 was Illegal

THE contention of the proponents of the claims of John Kedrovsky to the Archbishopric of North America and the Aleutian Islands is based upon the legality of the Sobor of 1923 and the lawfulness of its acts.

The whole question has been made the subject of careful study by Professor Sergius Troitsky, whose articles on the Living Church are found in the Appendix. Professor Troitsky is a Candidate of Theology of the Petrograd Academy of Divinity, and Master of Theology of the Kiev. He was General Secretary of the Moscow Sobor of 1917-18 and is the author of several works on Canon Law.

The following chapters contain the result of his study in full. Although in the course of his argument Professor Troitsky restates much that has already been said it seems best to state the whole case in his words. For convenience, we have separated his arguments, thus: first, on the "Legality of the Sobor"; secondly, on the "Canonicity of the Sobor"; thirdly, on the "Lack of Recognition of the Sobor." Concerning the legality of the Sobor, he states:

A. It is Illegal

The Sobor held at Moscow in 1923 was not a Sobor of the Orthodox Russian Church, but a Sobor of a dissident schismatic association called the Living Church, and as such it could not be an organ for the expression of the will of the Orthodox Russian Church. And since *nemo alteri plus juris dare potest, quam ipse habet,* it could not express the will of the Russian Church through the synod appointed by

this Sobor, either, and in particular in the matter of appointing Kedrovsky.

The legal incapacity of the Sobor of 1923 is proved by the fact that that Sobor was not convoked by the Patriarch.

Canonically, the Sobor of any Orthodox Church must be called by its ranking prelate (Apostolic Rules, 34, Antioch, 9 and 20, and others). "*No one* shall be permitted to form a Sobor on his own authority, without those bishops to whom the metropolitan sees are entrusted," categorically says Rule 20 of the Antioch Council, which has been recognized by Rule 2 of the Trullo Council as obligatory for the entire Orthodox Church. Although the Rule refers to a metropolitan see, whereas the Russian Church is patriarchal, it still is fully applicable in this case, because at the time of the Council of Antioch the autocephalous Churches of the several Church provinces, such as the Russian Church, were called "metropolitan" sees *(Mitropolii) (Cf. Nicodim Milosh, Pravila Pravoslavne Tserkve* . . . vol. II, Novi Sad, 1896, p. 60).

The same conditions are prescribed by special laws of the Russian Church, especially the decisions of the Moscow Sobor of 1917-1918.[1] Thus, the decision of the 8th of December, 1917, concerning the rights and duties of the Patriarch reads: "The Patriarch . . . summons the Church Sobor" (*Sobranie* . . ., I-II, Moscow, 1918, p. 4). The decision of September 5/18, 1918, concerning the powers of the members of the Sobor of 1917-1918 reads: *The Most Holy Patriarch has the right,* at any time, according to circumstances of Church life, to summon the Sobor in its present composition, while the members of the Sobor retain their powers" (*Sobranie* . . ., IV, p. 9). A decision on September 7/20, 1918, on the calling of the next Sobor says: *To leave it* to the Most Holy Patriarch to convoke the next Sobor in the spring of 1921, in conformity with the principles laid down in the report of the Department on the Supreme Church Administration for the calling of the greater Sobors in nine-year periods" (*Ibid.,* p. 10).

But the Sobor of 1923 was not called by the Patriarch but by the so-called Supreme Church Administration, which, not being authorized by the Patriarch to summon a Sobor, had no lawful right to exercise authority, but seized it forcibly. That the Patriarch had not transferred power to the Supreme Church Administration which called the Sobor of 1923 is proved by: (a) the testimony of the Patriarch himself and (b)

---

[1] That the Sobor of 1923 was summoned in violation of the resolutions of the Sobor of 1917-1918 is admitted by the reformists themselves. Thus we read in the *Golos Pravoslavnoi Ukrainy,* the publication of the Ukrainian Living Church, Kharkov, 1925, 1-2, p. 17, "The Sobor of 1923 was the antithesis of the Sobor of 1917."

of his lawful *locum tenens,* and (c) of the representatives of this Supreme Church Administration themselves.

a. The Patriarch, in his epistle issued at the Donskoi Monastery on July 15, 1923, thus describes the origin of the so-called Supreme Church Administration:

"In strict conformity with the decision of the Sobor[2] which has established the order of the Patriarchal administration for the Russian Church, and with the order of November 7, 1920, issued by the Holy Synod under its jurisdiction,[3] we have deemed it best to transfer, during the time we are removed from affairs,[4] the fullness of ecclesiastic power to our own appointed *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Agathangel of Yaroslav.[5] . . . But for reasons beyond our control he could not assume the execution of his duties. Of this, arbitrary persons took advantage in order to "enter into the sheepfold not by the door, but climbing up some other way" (St. John 10: 1), and to seize an authority which does not belong to them in the Orthodox Church.[6]

"On May 18th of the past year (1922, old style) there came to us, who at that time were in confinement at the Troitski Podvorie, the priests Vvedenski, Bielkov, Kalinovski (who recently unfrocked himself), and, pretending to be concerned for the weal of the Church, handed us a written declaration requesting us to entrust to them our chancellery, to attend to the orderly disposal of the papers there received. Deeming this useful, we yielded to their solicitation and wrote upon

---

[2] The Patriarch probably refers here to the decision of the Sobor issued December 8, 1917, on the rights and duties of the Patriarch, according to which "In the event that . . . the Patriarch should be on trial, his place in the Holy Synod and Supreme Church Council is taken by the ranking prelate present in the Synod" (12). The same provision is made in paragraph 8 of the notes to the decisions of the Sobor of 1918 (August 10th) concerning the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch.

[3] This refers to the decision of the Synod sub. No. 362, where the first paragraph reads: "In the event that the Holy Synod and Supreme Church Council . . . should discontinue . . . their work, the prelate of the diocese addresses himself directly to the Most Holy Patriarch or to that person and institutions which will be indicated by the Patriarch, for guidance in his official business and for the settlement of affairs according to rules under the Supreme Church Administration."

[4] Such a removal was caused by the arrest of the Patriarch by the Bolshevist authorities on May 3, 1922.

[5] The Metropolitan was not permitted to go to Moscow from Iaroslavl, and was later exiled to the Narym region in Siberia by the Soviet authorities.

[6] The authenticity of this epistle, which was printed in the *Tserkovnia Viedomosti,* 1923, 15-16, is confirmed by the epistle from Patriarch Tikhon to the Patriarch of Serbia, November 14, 1923, and by the epistle of a group of bishops, kept on file at the Archives of the Patriarchate at Belgrad.

their declaration the following resolution:[7] "The persons named below, that is, the priests who signed the declaration, are instructed to take over and transfer to the Most Reverend Metropolitan Agathangel, upon his arrival at Moscow, the affairs of the Synod." [8] . . . By virtue of this resolution, they were charged merely to take over these affairs and transfer them to Metropolitan Agathangel as soon as he arrives at Moscow. As to how they should act with regard to the affairs undertaken if Metropolitan Agathangel should not appear in Moscow at all, no disposition whatever had been made by us, because we could not then foresee such a possibility, while our blessing to their own persons acting in such an event instead of the Metropolitan and taking charge of the Church Administration could not be in that resolution, since the powers belonging to the rank of a bishop cannot be transmitted to presbyters. None the less they declared this resolution to have been an act transmitting to them the ecclesiastical authority and, coming to an agreement with Bishops Antoninus and Leonidas formed from among themselves the so-called Supreme Church Administration.

"Today we declare solemnly and in the hearing of all, and we witness from this sacred altar, that these categorical declarations on their part concerning an agreement with us and concerning a transmission by us of the rights and duties of the Patriarch of the Russian Church to the Supreme Church Administration composed by the Bishops Antoninus and Leonidas and the Priests Vvedenski and Bielkov are nothing but falsehood and deceit and that the named persons have possessed themselves of the Church power by abitrary seizure, without any legitimate powers provided by the rules of our Church." [9]

---

[7] The text of this resolution in full has been published in the organ of the Ukrainian Living Church itself, the *Golos Pravoslavnoi Ukrainy,* Kharkov, 1-2, January, 1925, p. 8.

[8] See the testimony of Professor Titlinov, one of the leaders of the Living Church, saying: "There is no doubt that the group of clergymen who formed the Supreme Church Administration after the abdication of Patriarch Tikhon did not possess any authorization from the Patriarch to do that" (*Novaia Tserkov,* p. 55).

[9] In the *Zion Herald* of February 20, 1924, appears an interview with Leonidas, where it is stated that "when Tikhon was arrested he left Leonidas in charge of Church affairs, and he, as the eldest, invited the adherents of reform, headed by Antoninus, to take part in this administration." This could not be the case, however, because Leonidas was not only not the eldest ranking member of the Synod, but no member of the Synod at all; and according to the decision of the Sobor on July 28th (Aug. 10th), 1918, *Opredielenie,* p. 8, he might obtain the rights of the Patriarch, not in his capacity of Head of the Russian Church, but only diocesan bishop, if the Patriarch thus willed. Nor did Antoninus, being retired, have the right to assume the Church administration, as stated afterwards (Oct. 1, 1925) by Metropolitan Peter, as Patriarchal *locum tenens,* to the delegation from the Sobor (see organ of Liv. Ch., the *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 6, p. 13).

b. The *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Agathangel, in his epistle issued June 5/18, 1922, writes:

"Other people appeared in Moscow and assumed the administration of the Russian Church. What powers they had received for that is absolutely unknown to me. And therefore I regard the authority which they have taken upon themselves, and their actions, as unlawful. . . . They have announced their intention to . . . organize the 'first' of what they call the 'Living Church.' "

The Metropolitan then goes on to say that he intends to summon an All-Russian Sobor which would restore the lawful Church authority, and until then he gives the bishops the right to "administer their dioceses independently, in conformity with the Scriptures, sacred canons, and applying to him in case of doubt" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* August 1-15, 1922, No. 10-11, pp. 1-2).

c. The story of the seizure of the Church authority by the so-called Supreme Church Administration, as told by the Patriarch and his *locum tenens,* is fully corroborated also by the prominent leaders of the Living, or Synodical, Church that was organized by the same Administration.[10] We have before us a pamphlet by a member of this Church, who was a member of its 1923 and 1925 Sobors, a member of the presiding board of the latter Sobor, and who acted as its secretary,[11] Prof B. V. Titlinov (*Novaia Tserkov,* Petrograd and Moscow, 1923, printed by Ginsburg in 4,000 copies). There, on pp. 9-10, we read:

"The Petrograd opposition group sent delegates to Moscow, and on May 12th they called on the Patriarch and had a determined talk with him. . . . The result of this talk proved unexpectedly decisive. Patriarch Tikhon abdicated the administration of the Church, having written a resolution transferring the power to one of the ranking prelates until the convocation of the Sobor. As for the process of the transfer of the official business, he entrusted it to the same group of clergymen who had called on him. But the initiators of the Church opposition were not satisfied with this role only, *and went farther. They constituted themselves a provisional Church authority* and only after this did they enter into negotiations with the *locum tenens* designated by the Patriarch. . . . Metropolitan Agathangel *did not accept the offer.*

---

[10] In the beginning the adherents of the new church organization themselves took the designation of Living Church, at their constituent convention on May 29, 1922, in Moscow (see Titlinov, *Novaia Tserkov,* p. 10), and published a periodical under this title. But later on, in view of the unpopularity of the Living Church, they commenced to style it the "Synodal, or Orthodox, Russian Church," thereby misleading the people.

[11] See the *Tserkovnoie Obnovlenie,* November 25, 1925, and the *Viestnik Sviashchennago Synoda* for 1926, No. 7.

Thereupon the provisional administration created by the Church opposition under the presidency of Bishop Antoninus refrained from seeking a successor to the Patriarch and proclaimed itself the supreme Church administration."

It is clear, therefore, that this administration was created contrary to the will of the Patriarch as well as of his *locum tenens,* and Professor Titlinov is quite right in calling the Living Church "revolutionary." [12]

"The Living Church, having removed Patriarch Tikhon and the patriarchal administration, takes the Church authority into its own hands in the same way as the party of the Bolsheviks once took the state authority into its own hands. A new mechanism of authority, with new principles, is being created" (p. 34).

But while a revolution in political life sometimes does create new law, this cannot happen in the Orthodox Church. In the Orthodox Church the basis of ecclesiastical authority is a voluntary and unbroken transmission of authority, a succession of authority from the times of the Apostles down to our own day,[13] and where there is no such voluntary transmission there cannot be any Orthodox Church. Therefore the Sobor of 1923, summoned by a self-appointed organization without the sanction of the lawful and at that time not yet condemned head of the Russian Church, Patriarch Tikhon, was not a legitimate Sobor, but what is styled by the canons as a "schismatic assemblage" or *parasynagogue, i.e., falsa synagoga, illicitus conventus.* A *parasynagogue,* according to the definition of Rule 1 of Basilius the Great, is an "assemblage which is made up of recalcitrant presbyters and bishops, or the unlearned populace." [14]

---

[12] The "Proclamation" issued by the convention of the Living Church in August, 1922, admits likewise that this church had "taken the ecclesiastico-revolutionary path" (Titlinov, *op. cit.,* p. 19). Again, "the leaders of the movement themselves style the new church movement revolutionary, and such a definition appears to be the most appropriate" (p. 36). "The leaders of the Living Church *themselves* took the authority in a revolutionary extra-canonical and, if you please, anti-canonical manner" (p. 55). The path of the Living Church is not canonical" (p. 60).

[13] *Macarius, Pravoslavnoie Dogmaticheskoie Bogoslovie,* paragraph 181; *Nicodim Milosh, Pravoslavno—Tserkovnoie Pravo,* Mostar, 1902, p. 292. "Thus far, history has known almost no cases of Church revolutions," admits Professor Titlinov also (p. 38).

[14] On the uncanonical nature of the Sobor of 1923, as one not summoned by the Patriarch, there spoke at the Living Church Sobor of 1925 also the lay member Plotnikov. (See the organ of the Living Church, *Viestnik Sviashchenennago Sobora Pravoslavnoi Rossiskoi Tserkvi,* 1926, No. 6, p. 15). "To find canonical justification for Church revolution would be difficult, and to look for it is useless," frankly agrees even Professor Titlinov (*Novaia Tserkov,* pp. 53-54).

Neither does the decision of the Sobor of 1917-1918 to summon the next Sobor in the spring of 1921 endow the Sobor of 1923 with legal validity, because:

1. The year 1923 is not the year 1921:[15]

2. The decision concerning the convocation of the next Sobor (See *Sobranie Opredielenij,* IV, p. 10) does not at all oblige the Patriarch to summon the Sobor in the spring of 1921, but merely grants him the right to do so before the nine-year term provided, *i.e.,* 1927.

3. The Patriarch could, according to circumstances, also postpone the calling of the Sobor, such a right being granted to him by the canons, *e.g.,* of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, where Rule 8 provides that "because of barbarian raids, and because *of other accidental reasons,* the heads of the Church have no opportunity to convoke the Councils" (*Cf.* The Seventh Ecumenical Council, Rule 6).

4. If, notwithstanding repeated attempts, the Patriarch and his *locum tenens* have thus far been unable to summon a Sobor, it is the fault of the Bolshevist authority, which, through the intrigues of the Living Church, does not permit the convocation of any Sobor.[16] Nevertheless the Orthodox Episcopate of the Russian Church expresses its Church-governing will, by exchanging epistles (see about this the epistle of the Patriarch *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Sergius, in the *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1926, 15-16, p. 18).

---

[15] Judge MacAvoy is therefore entirely in error when he says: "The Sobor of 1917 provides for a convocation of the Sobor not later than in 1923." It provides for a convocation of the Sobor either in 1921 or 1927.

[16] The *Golos Pravoslavnoi Ukrainy,* January 1925, No. 1-2, admits that the Orthodox Sobor planned for August 19, 1922, in the Ukraine, did not meet "because of circumstances beyond control."

CHAPTER IV

The Sobor was Uncanonical

CONCERNING the Uncanonical nature of the Sobor, Professor Troitsky states:

The Sobor of 1923 was not a valid Sobor, not only because it was summoned illegally, but also because it was organized irregularly, and not in conformity with the fundamental canons of the Orthodox Church. This irregularity appears in: (a) the elections to the Sobor, and (b) the role of bishops in the same.

a. The Sobor of 1923 was not a Sobor of freely chosen representatives of the entire Russian Church, but was artificially picked out by a group of persons who had seized without right the ecclesiastical authority. The "Statutes Concerning the Elections to the Sobor" drawn up by this group included in the Sobor, without election, a large number of individuals who favored the schism,[1] namely, the members of the Supreme Church Administration of the Living Church (paragraph 37), all the authorized representatives of this Administration attached to the offices of the diocesan prelates (par. 39), the central committees of the reformist groups (par. 43), 25 persons invited by the Supreme Church Administration (par. 40). Furthermore, this administration reserved for itself the right to replace as it saw fit any person who for any reason could not attend the Sobor, that is to say, any person whom they themselves might remove under any pretext (par. 41).

As a result of the application of all these paragraphs, 189 out of the 476 members of the Sobor, according to the official count announced by the secretary of the Sobor at the session of May 4, 1923, were found to

---

[1] From the decisions of the constituent convention of the Living Church on May 29, 1922, at Moscow, it can be seen that this group made its objects: (1) "the elimination from the general mass of the Orthodox Church people" of its adherents; (2) their unification in all provinces; and (3) capturing with the aid of these organizations both the local Church administrations and the next Sobor (see Titlinov, *Novaia Tserkov,* pp. 10-12).

be appointed instead of elected. As elected there figured only 287, but only *figured,* as there had been no free election. First of all, the Orthodox themselves could not participate in a schismatic assembly called by an illegal Church authority, since, according to the canons (Apostl. 45, Third Ecum. 2, Laod. 33, and others), as well as according to the ruling made both orally and in writing by the Orthodox bishops (*e.g.,* the below-mentioned epistle of three members of the Orthodox Synod), they themselves would in this event be guilty of schism.

On the other hand, the Supreme Church Administration, too, demanded that only adherents of the Living Church should be chosen to the Sobor. According to Parag. 6 of the Statutes of the Convocation of the Sobor, membership was denied to persons "convicted by ecclesiastical trial during the period of the reformists movement." By virtue of this provision there were eliminated from the Sobor all the supporters of Patriarch Tikhon, and, above all, all Orthodox bishops, because every one of these had been deprived of his post by the Supreme Church Administration for refusing to recognize the Living Church. For this reason the Orthodox could gain access to the Sobor only accidentally, through lack of information. And, as a matter of fact, we do see that, although the Living Church officially states that only a minority of the Orthodox population,[2] not more than about one-fourth, belong to it, the minority at the Sobor belonged to the "Tikhonians," or the nonpartisans. These numbered only 45.

Many members of this Sobor had no right to participate, according to the canons. All the Siberian bishops, with the exception of Peter Blinov, had been consecrated with the participation of the former Bishop of Kirensk, Zosima Sidorovski, who had already in 1920 renounced his monastic vows, unfrocked himself as a bishop, and contracted a marriage. And from the standpoint of the Church canons (Fourth Ecumenical, 16; Trull., 12 and 44; Ancyr., 19; Basilius the Great, 6, 18, 19 and 60) these are crimes which not only deprive the guilty forever of the right to minister, but also impose years of punishment, while the imposition of hands by an unlawful bishop is of itself unlawful.

b. In the Orthodox Church the supreme authority, both in matters of legislation and of administration, belongs to the bishops exclusively. "The entire fulness of church authority is concentrated in the Sobor of the bishops," writes Nicodim Milosh, the most authoritative Serbian canonist (Tserkveno Prava, second edition, Mostar, 1920, p. 248), and this in such an absolute sense that without this the Church would cease being what it is, and its organization would no longer be what it was meant to be. This doctrine of the Orthodox Church forms the founda-

[2] See page 74, note 6.

tion of its entire law. This is why the canons recognize only full-fledged bishops as the fully empowered members of Sobors.[3] There have been participating in Sobors also non-episcopal ministers, monks, and even laymen, but they had no decisive vote there and did not sign the resolutions in their own names. At the Moscow Sobor of 1917-1918, likewise, we had many ordinary priests and laymen, but here, again, these had no decisive vote, as decisions of the Sobor were valid only when approved by a conference of bishops only.

It was a different matter with the organization of the Sobor of 1923.[4] According to a report in the official organ of the Soviet Government, the *Izviestia,* May 4, 1923, the Sobor of 1923 was attended by 476 persons, and among these were only 62 bishops, *i.e.,* less than one out of seven. And yet the decisions in this instance were adopted definitely, and at once, by a general vote, so that these decisions are not formally the decisions of an Orthodox Sobor.[5]

c. In its activities, likewise, this Sobor was not Orthodox. The Protestant, anti-hierarchic tendency of this Sobor appeared not only in the very organization of the Sobor, but also in its decisions concerning the future organization of the Church, but especially the decision regarding re-marriage of priests.

According to Orthodox doctrine concerning the Church, there must be, apart from the common consecration of all believers, a particular, mystic, hierarchic consecration, set apart from the rest objectively by the imposition of hands and subjectively by higher personal morals. As the outward, juridical expression of this higher moral qualification, according to Orthodox doctrine, serves either celibacy or absolute monogamy of the priest, wherefore the rule of a single marriage serves, as it were, in the capacity of a "standard of the sacrament of consecration," as the *normam quandan sacramenti,* according to the expression of St. Augustine (*"De liono conjugali, cap.* 21, Migne, Patrol," lat. t. 40, col.

---

[3]Rule 47 of Basilios the Great.

[4] In this respect the Sobor of 1923 answered the general character of the Living Church as one not episcopal, but presbyterian. "The presbyterian principle of administration," writes Titlinov (*op. cit.,* p. 31), "was realized from the very first steps of the Living Church by giving most positions in the church-governing bodies to the presbyters." (*Cf.* also pp. 17 and 39.) "There is established the principle of presbyterian instead of episcopal administration."

[5] It was justly pointed out also at the Detroit assembly that the Sobor of 1923 was of a group character, combining groups of different religious views and without dogmatic unanimity (*Postanovlenia,* pp. 9-10). The Living Church itself was forced to admit the fact of this kind of organization and its irregularity at the convention of August, 1923, which put the Synod in place of the Supr. Ch. Admin. of the Liv. Ch. (see *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 6, p. 14), and group lists were voted on.

388). "What distinction would there be between the people and the priest, if they were subject to the same laws?" writes St. Ambrosius of Milan, demonstrating the absoluteness of the interdiction against re-marriage. "The life of the priest must transcend just as the beatitude transcends (*praeponderat*)" (*Ep. ad ccl.* Vercell, Migne, t. 26, col. 1206). This is why the Orthodox Church views the interdict against re-marriage of ministers in the same way as the existence of three degrees of consecrated hierarchy in this Church, regarding it as a Scripture-sanctioned (Timothy, 3:2 and 12; Titus, 1:6), unalterable principle of divine law which the Church cannot repudiate if it wants to remain orthodox.

It is precisely this doctrine which we find in the generally obligatory Church canons (Apostles, 17; Trull, 3; Basilius, 12), in the ancient writings of the Church fathers,[6] and in the resolutions and decisions of the Sobors of the Russian Church, ending with the Moscow Sobor of 1917-1918. "The interdict prohibiting widowed and divorced ministers to contract a second marriage, being based upon the commands of the Apostles (Timothy, 3:2 and 12; Titus, 1:6),[7] the Church canons (Rule 3 of the Trull Council and others), the idea underlying Christian marriage, and a high conception of the obligations of priesthood, must be unalterably observed" (*Sobranie Opredielenij* . . ., Moscow, 1918, IV, p. 76).

The Sobor of 1923 refers to precedent in the ancient Church for justification of its resolution permitting re-marriage to the clergy. In reality, however, these precedents represent the influence of Nestorianism upon certain Church dignitaries, and not a tradition for the Church, and even if we should grant that the Sobor of 1923 erred in this respect in good faith, still, being merely a council of the local Church, and not an ecumenical one, it did not possess formally the right to repudiate the decisions of the ecumenical councils[8] without having obtained first the

[6] A chronological collection of testimony beginning with Apostolic times and brought down to 1884, to prove that the Orthodox Church at no time and no place ever permitted re-marriage of priests, has been brought together by the present writer in his book, the *Re-marriage of Clergymen (Vtorobrachie Klirikov)*, St. Petersburg, 1912, publ. by the Synodal Typography, pp. 135-173, a work which brought the author the Makariev Prize.

[7] From this it may be seen that, according to the doctrine of the Orthodox Russian Church, this interdict is based not only on the canons, but also on Holy Writ, so that it is impossible to justify its repeal even by a theory of mutability of the canons.

[8] "No one shall be permitted to alter or abolish the above-mentioned rules (among them also Rule 17 of the Apostles, and 12 of Basilios, prohibiting re-marriage of clergymen)," says Rule 2 of the Council of Trull, while the 16th Sardinian rule subjects bishops to unfrocking for violation of the canons.

consent of either all the autocephalous Orthodox Churches or an ecumenical council. The same should be said about the permission granted by the Sobor to bishops to contract a first marriage after their consecration by imposition of hands, and their marriage in general.[9] All questions subject to the jurisdiction of the ecumenical councils and for which the sacred canons are intended, says an epistle from Photius, Patriarch of Alexandria, to Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, dated June 23, 1923, No. 211—all these matters may be considered and interpreted only by an ecumenical council (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, 1-15th of September, No. 17-18, p. 4).[10] An identical decision was made by the Antioch Council, as Patriarch Gregory of Antioch informed Metropolitan Anthony, the President of the Prelatic Synod, by epistle of October 8 (210, 1923, No. 1356) (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, November 1-15, No. 21-22, pp. 1-2).

---

[9] I Timothy 3:2 does not conflict with the 12th Rule of Trull, as the former does not say at all that bishops must be married, but merely forbids the consecration to bishoprics of those who will have married a second time.

[10] From the explanation written concerning the verdict of the New York Court of Appeals by Attorney M. I. Petchkovski, I am aware that Kedrovsky referred to a clipping from the *Tserkovny Viestnik* (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti*) at the trial as to an anonymous news report. The fact, however, is that the *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti* is the official organ of the Prelatic Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad, and we therefore attach great importance to documents published by it, the more so as we saw all the epistles of the Eastern patriarchs and other prelates also in the original, convincing ourselves of their authenticity (they are provided with the regular seals, are written on official paper, and so forth) as well as of the truthfulness of the translation appearing in *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti.*

CHAPTER V

The Sobor Never Received Official Recognition

THE Moscow Sobor of 1923 was from the start refused recognition as the legitimate ecclesiastical power (a) In Russia and (b) outside of Russia.

That it was not recognized by Patriarch Tikhon, the Orthodox Synod, and the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, is proved: 1. By the epistle of Patriarch Tikhon issued on the 6th of December, 1922, at the Donskoi Monastery, in which epistle we read: "We forbid to recognize the Supreme Church Administration, it being an institution of the Antichrist, and there being in it present the Sons of the Adversary striving against the Divine Truth, and against the holy Church canons. Be it known to all of you that, by the authority granted to us by God we anathematize the Supreme Church Administration and all those who have any communion with the same" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, June 1-15, No. 11-12). And since the Sobor of 1923 was convoked and led by this Administration, it came in pleno under this patriarchal ban.

2. By Patriarch Tikhon's epistle on the occasion of his reassumption of the administration of the Church, on July 15, 1923, following his release from prison,[1] where he says: "The Supreme Church Administration and the reformist Synod came into being without authorization, and all the categorical declarations made by the members of these organizations, as to any agreement with them and as to a transfer of the rights and duties of the Patriarch of the Russian Church to the Supreme Church Administration composed of Bishops Antoninus and Leonidas, and the priests Vvedenski, Krasnitski, Kalinovski, and Bielkov, are nothing but falsehood and fraud. The persons named here possessed

[1] The authenticity of this epistle has not been denied in the publications of the Living Church itself, in Russia. An epistle from the Orthodox Russian Bishops addressed to the Serbian Patriarch Dimitri and on file in the archives of the Patriarchal Office, reads: "Now this fraud (about the alleged transmission of authority by the Patriarch to the Living Church) has been exposed, by the epistle of July 15th of this year, in which Patriarch Tikhon . . ."

themselves of the Church power by means of usurpation, arbitrarily, without any of the legal authority provided for by the regulations of our Church. . . . The persons who established at Moscow the Supreme Church Administration and who are guilty of this before the Church aggravated their offense by consecrating bishops (and Kedrovski among them.—S. T.) in illegally seized provinces, thereby placing themselves under the effect of Rule 35 of the Apostles, which threatens with loss of rank both those who consecrate in another diocese and those who are thus consecrated by them. . . . All dispositions by the canonically successionless and illegitimate authority ruling the Church in our absence are null and void (consequently also the consecration of Kedrovski—S. T.), and every act and sacrament administered by these apostate priests and bishops is unbeatific and without power (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, August 1-15, No. 15-16, pp. 1-3; 1925, No. 7-8, p. 17).

3. By the resolution written by Patriarch Tikhon on the act depriving him of the patriarchal dignity, reading: "illegal. The Humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias," witnessed by the official report of the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, 9-10, pp. 2-3).

4. By the epistle from Patriarch Tikhon to Patriarch Dimitri of Serbia, despatched from Moscow on November 8-21, 1923, where we read the following: "Having again entered, on the first of this July, upon the performance of our services as primate of the Russian Church, we, in common with the vast host of bishops loyal to their duty, have considered null and void the decisions of the assembly that met at Moscow in the month of May of the current year and which vainly tried to play the part of a Church Sobor.

5. This is demonstrated also by the whole course of action on the part of the Patriarch. He did not recognize a single act of the Sobor of 1923 and the Synod it appointed, and the clergymen appointed by it he readmitted to the Orthodox Church after they had repented, as members of an unauthorized assemblage, in conformity with the first rule of Basilius the Great.[2]

6. By the decision of the Orthodox Holy Synod, represented by three of its members not imprisoned by the Bolsheviks,[3] where, among other things, the following questions are settled: "How shall we act in the case of a diocese whose bishop becomes apostate by recognizing the

---

[2] This is mentioned also in the organ of the Living Church *Viestnik Sviaschennago Synoda,* 1926, No. 7, by Titlinov, in his article entitled "What Has Been Done for Church Peace?" p. 9.

[3] Their names are known to me, but I am unable to divulge them, fearful of exposing them to Bolshevist reprisals.

Supreme Church Administration (of the Living Church)?" and "Shall we take part in the Sobor called by the Supreme Church Administration?" To the first question, the answer is made that with such a bishop all communication is to cease, and the second is answered to the effect that "In no case whatsoever, as it is called by an illegal Church authority." As regards the Living Church, it is pointed out that it is not a Church of Christ, but one of thieves and robbers, and that whosoever goes to that Church falls away from the Church of God and, in the words of the Saviour, becomes like unto a pagan and rebel (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, June 1-15, No. 11-12, pp. 1-2).

From this it is manifest that Orthodox people could not participate in the elections to the Sobor of 1923, and, as a matter of fact, they did not so participate in many places, and if they did vote here and there, it was only because of lack of knowledge. Nor did the Orthodox take part in the elections to the Sobor of 1925.[4] nor in the Sobor itself, as testified also by D'Herbigny (*Church Life at Moscow,* p. 79).

The Patriarchal *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Agathangel, appointed by the patriarchal epistle of May 3-16 and so recognized also by the temporal powers, likewise refused to recognize the Sobor of 1923. That he did not recognize the very origin of this Sobor is witnessed by his epistle to the Orthodox Russian Church issued on June 5-18, 1922, at Iaroslavl (No. 14), which see above.

The Sobor of 1923 was denied recognition also by the subsequent *locum tenens* of the patriarchal see, Metropolitan Peter (Polianski) of Krutitsy, and Metropolitan Sergius (Starogorodski) of Nizhni-Novgorod. The first, in his epistle of June 28, 1925,[5] writes: They must do genuine penance for their errors. Their principal error has been that, having arbitrarily fallen away from the lawful diocese and its head, the Most Holy Patriarch, they attempted to reform the Church of Christ by an arbitrary doctrine (*Zhivaia Tserkov,* No. 1-11), they distorted the Church regulations established by the ecumenical councils (decision of the pseudo-Sobor of May 4, 1923), they repudiated the authority of the Patriarch established and recognized by all the Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, *i.e.,* they repudiated that which has been recognized by all Orthodox people and, moreover, they condemned him at their pseudo-Sobor. Contrary to the rules of the Holy Apostles, the Ecumenical Councils, and the Holy Fathers (Apostles, rules 17 and 18; Fourth Ecumenical Council, Rules 3, 12, and 48; Basilius the Great, Rule 12), they

---

[4] *Cf.* the *Viestnik* of the Sobor, 1926, No. 7, p. 4; "The Old Church people refused to come to the Sobor."

[5] The authenticity of this epistle is recognized also by Professor Titlinov in the article mentioned above, p. 5.

permit bishops to marry and ordinary priests to remarry, that is to say, they are violating that which the entire Ecumenical Orthodox Church regards as law and which may be repealed or amended exclusively by the Ecumenical Council. In this way they break the connection with the sacred traditions of the Church and are subject to condemnation by the Sobor for violating the traditions (Dogmatic definitions by the Seventh Ecumenical Sobor). Even the original leaders of the reformist movement (Bishop Antoninus and others) themselves realized the uncanonical nature of their errors, which they openly and persistently proclaim in their sermons and addresses" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1925, November 1 to 15, No. 21-22, pages 3-4). Metropolitan Peter is the *locum tenens* of the patriarchal see by virtue of the testament of Patriarch Tikhon of December 25, 1924 (January 7, 1925), and the act of April 12, 1925, signed by more than sixty prelates.

Metropolitan Peter on October 1st also gave the following answer in response to questions asked by a delegation from the Sobor of 1925 as to what he charged the reformists with: (1) they had seized power arbitrarily . . . (5) the Sobor of 1923 had no right to deprive Tikhon of the Patriarchal and monastic rank, (6) re-marriage of the clergy is uncanonical, and (7) the Sobor of 1923 has distorted the rules of the Church.[6]

Regarding the attitude of the Metropolitan of Nizhni-Novgorod, Sergius, toward the Living Church, Professor Titlinov says that he "has shown himself to be one of the most irreconcilable" opponents and that he "demands penance of the leaders of the Living Church."[7]

The Sobor of 1923 has never been recognized by any of the Russian bishops abroad, thirty-two of whom were united at the Sobor in Sremskie Karlovtzy and by the Synod elected by this Sobor. This is witnessed by: (a) the epistle of the president of the Synod, Metropolitan Anthony, of February 5-18, 1923, No. 347 (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* February 1-15, 1923, No. 3-4, pp. 1-2); (b) his "Otzyv" concerning the Moscow Sobor (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* May 1-15, 1923, No. 9-10, page 10) and others; (c) decision of the Sobor of Prelates of the Russian Church abroad dated May 23-June 5, 1923. Referring to rule 15 of the Second Constantinople Council, which provides that "if any presbyter or bishop or Metropolitan shall dare sever his communion with his Patriarch and shall without Sobor proclamation and actual conviction cause a schism, the Holy Sobor has resolved that such shall be entirely removed from any priesthood," the Sobor says that bishops and

---

[6] See the organ of the Living Church, *Viestnik Sviaschennago Sobora,* No. 6, 1926, p. 13.

[7] The above mentioned article, page 5.

presbyters refusing to submit to the Patriarch long before their "Sobor" and his trial, must be considered as deprived of priesthood, as rebels against the legitimate Church authority who have willfully repudiated it. As for the Sobor summoned by the Living Church, that is to say, an unlawful ecclesiastical authority, they proclaim it to be not only without any authority, but, in so far as it serves merely as a weapon in the hands of the atheist Soviet power against Christianity, it is also anti-Christian (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* June 1-15, 1923, No. 11-12, page 3); (d) the circular epistle of Metropolitan Anthony to all Orthodox Patriarchs and other prelates; (e) his reply of September 19-October 2, 1923, No. 911, to the so-called Metropolitan Evdokim (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* October 1-15, 1923, No. 19-20, pages 2-5); (f) his circular epistle of July 31-August 13, 1925 (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti, August* 1-15, 1925, No. 15-16, pages 1-2), and others.

December 2, 1924, the author wrote to a number of prelates of the Eastern Church with whom he had discussed the Russian and American problems earlier in the year. Among these was Metropolitan Anthony of Kief, head of the Karlowitz Synod of refugee bishops. He had discussed this matter with the Metropolitan while his guest at Karlowitz and later while traveling with him from Egypt to Jerusalem. The Metropolitan replied to this letter as follows:

"President of the Episcopal Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia.

"30th December, 1925, No. 362F.
"Sremski Karlovci, S. H. S.

"*Reverend Sir:*

"In reply to your letter of December 2d, I have the honor to forward to you a copy of my petition to the Court of Appeals of New York concerning the decision in favor of John Kedrovsky, calling himself Archbishop. I have the honor to inform you also, that the 'Councils' of Moscow of 1923 and 1925 are not canonical nor lawful because they were arranged not by the lawful successor, but by a small group of dissenters from the many millions of the Orthodox people of the Russian Church, and no Orthodox bishop, cleric, or layman ever took part in them. Their decisions were maintained by the Bolsheviks with the most inhuman terror, in order to kill Orthodoxy in Russia. But all their endeavors were without success, and the greatest part of the clergy, and

all the Orthodox people, remained true to the traditions of the Russian Orthodox Church and to her Head, the Patriarch Tikhon, whose lawful successor now, after his death, is His Grace the Metropolitan Peter of Crutitz, accepted by the whole Russian Orthodox Church.

"Not a single autocephalous Orthodox Church, such as the Churches of Constantinople, of Greece, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, of Chipre [Cyprus], of Serbia, of Roumania, of Bulgaria did ever accept these Bolshevik 'Sobors' and their Synod, the bishops of which have lost their dignity for their immoral life, transgressions against the Holy Canons, and rebellion against the lawful Church authority.

"All leaders of the Eastern Orthodox Churches accepted the Holy Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, as a lawful Head of the Russian Church till his death and all Orthodox world acknowledge him as a Confessor. The yearly Episcopal Council of the Russian Church outside of Russia, at Srem. Karlovci, consisting of 37 Bishops, leaders of the Russian Church outside of Russia, and also the Episcopal Synod, its organ, has never accepted the Bolshevik 'Sobors' of 1923 and 1925, and even condemned them.

"The same said Council and Synod of the Russian Church outside of Russia acknowledge the Metropolitan Platon to be the Head of the Orthodox Russian Diocese in America.

"We enclose herewith several issues of our official paper, *Cerkovnaja Viedomosti* in which there are documents, decisions, and epistles of some leaders of Orthodox autocephalous Churches, showing the 'Sobors' of 1923 and 1925, and also the Bolsheviks 'Synod' in Moscow as assemblies of impostors, and the Patriarch Tikhon till his death, and his lawful successor Metropolitan Peter as lawful Heads of the Russian Church.

"We beseech the National Council of the Episcopal Church to help our rightful case and to prevent false bishop Kedrovsky to violate the truth.

"Calling God's blessing upon you,
I have the honor to be
Truly and respectfully yours,

SEAL " (Signed) Metropolitan Anthony."

The following year the author saw the Metropolitan frequently in London and was with him during a pilgrimage of several days in Wales. It was manifest, for reasons to be explained in a later chapter, that the Metropolitan had lost his friendliness toward Metropolitan Platon. He was unchanged,

however, in his attitude toward the Sobor of 1923 and the Living Church.

b. The Sobor of 1923 has not been recognized and is not now recognized as a Sobor of the Orthodox Church by the other Orthodox Churches, and they even positively condemn it as an assemblage of dissenters, so that we may say that this Sobor stands condemned by the entire Orthodox Church, by its unanimous agreement *(consontu ecclesiae dispersae)*, which, in the absence of ecumenical councils, is the supreme organ of authority in the Orthodox Church. In particular, we are able to cite official acts condemning the Sobor of 1923 by the following Churches: (1) Constantinople, (2) Antioch, (3) Jerusalem, (4) Cyprus, (5) Serbia, (6) Greece, (7) Poland.

1. *The Church of Constantinople.*

a. Resolutions of the Holy Synod and the Mixed Council presided over by Patriarch Meletios, dated April 11-24, read: "To inform the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch at Moscow that the Great Church will not only refuse to delegate to the trial (organized by the Sobor of 1923) its representative, but it also recommends to the Russian prelates to refrain from any participation in the same, because all orthodoxy considers the Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias as a confessor of the faith." (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1923, No. 7-8).

b. The decree of the All-Orthodox Congress at Constantinople communicated to Metropolitan Anthony by the epistle of Patriarch Meletios the Fourth dated July 4, 1923, No. 3244, says: "The All-Orthodox Congress at Constantinople having learned of the meeting at Moscow of the Church Sobor which, *among the other uncanonical decisions,* also adopted the decision to depose the now imprisoned Patriarch Tikhon, has unanimously resolved to . . ." (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* August 1-15, 1923, No. 15-16, page 4).

c. The epistle of the Ecumenical Patriarch Gregory VII of December 27, 1923, No. 5856, where it says concerning Patriarch Tikhon: "May the Lord grant early comfort and succor . . . to the most Holy Patriarch Tikhon, whose long sufferings cause us grief" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* January 1-15, 1926, No. 1-2, page 3), from which it will be seen that the Ecumenical Patriarch did not recognize Tikhon's conviction, and that he was on his side, and not on the side of the Living Church.[8]

---

[8] The originals of most of these epistles are kept on file in the archives of the Supreme Administration of the Russian Orthodox Church at Karlowitz, and copies, duly certified, have been sent by the Chancellery of this Administration to Theophilus (Pashkovsky), Bishop of Chicago.

2. *The Church of Antioch.*

a. Patriarch Gregory of Antioch writes to Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev on behalf of the Holy Sobor of Antioch, on October 19-November 1, 1923, under No. 1414: "We deem it necessary once more to confirm to your reverence our previous emphatic declaration that we have not and shall not have any communion with the so-called Living Church people, these *unlawful usurpers of the Church authority in Russia,* . . ., and that we consider as the only legitimate supreme head of the Holy Russian Church the most holy Patriarch Tikhon, whose holy name we continue to mention in our divine services together with the names of all the primates of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti, November* 1-15, 1923, No. 21 and 22, pages 2-3).

b. His epistle of June 20, 1925, reading: "Patriarch Tikhon is a steadfast champion and protector of the purity of Orthodoxy and an intrepid defender of the inviolability of the Holy Canons. . . . According to our unshakable conviction, the only Church authority in Russia that is legitimate is the supreme authority of the All-Russian Patriarch" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* September 1-15, 1925, pages 3-4).

The author has in his possession the original of the following statement from the Patriarch of Gregorios, of which the following is an exact translation:

Your Grace:

Beloved brother in the Lord and partaker with me of the Holy Sacraments, Most Reverend Platon, Metropolitan of All America and Canada.

We greet you with the brotherly kiss, sacred in Christ, and inquire about your precious health and well-being, fervently praying for the restoration of blessed peace and tranquillity in the life of the Holy Church and the peoples of the world in general, and that of Great Russia, dear to us all, in particular.

On June 20/July 3 of this year we received Your Grace's most gracious letter of April 29/May 12 of this year, No. 867, in regard to the so-called Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church which was to be convoked in Moscow for the purpose of passing judgment on the Most Holy and Blessed Patriarch Tikhon, innocent sufferer for the Holy Faith, and the representatives of which would have been members of the self-appointed and illegal "Supreme Church Administration" and their candidates, the pseudo-bishops—and we hasten to send you our brotherly reply thereto.

A similar message requesting us not to recognize as legal the above

mentioned Soviet servants, these godless usurpers of the Supreme Church Authority in Russia, was sent out on February 5/13 of this year, No. 347, in the name of His Grace Anthony, Metropolitan of Kiev, Chairman of the Temporary Synod of the Russian Church abroad; another message to the same effect was sent out by His Grace Evlogi, Metropolitan of the Russian Orthodox Churches in Western Europe, dated April 10/23, 1923, No. 428. We replied to the first communication on April 12/25, No. 572, and to the second on May 19/June 1 of this year, No. 735.

And now, replying to Your Grace and approving of your decision "not to have any intercourses with the pseudo-sobor, the so-called Living Church and the Supreme Church Administration, as well as with such organizations and institutions as may be constituted and elected by the pseudo-sobor," but "to proclaim that the North American Diocese is and will be subordinated to the lawful Church Authority in the presence of the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon and the Church institutions and persons acting on the basis of the resolutions of the Moscow Sobor of 1917/18, and the message of the substitute for the Most Holy Patriarch, His Grace Metropolitan Agathangel, of June 5/18, 1922, No. 214," we in turn, reasserting our former declarations to Their Graces Metropolitans Anthony and Evlogi, again declare emphatically that we never have had nor ever shall have any intercourse with the above mentioned lawless and godless representatives of the so-called Living Church and the Supreme Church Administration. As regards our Most Holy and Blessed Brother Patriarch Tikhon, his deeply revered personality is held by us in fittingly high and lasting esteem and his name is always mentioned in the course of the service, together with those of the other heads of the Autonomous Churches.

We fervently pray that Christ, our Lord, may preserve His Holy Church in purity and integrity, deliver Holy Russia from the great trials that have befallen her, and grant you and all defenders of the Holy Faith strength and support. May the blessing of the Almighty be with us and among us forever.

Your Grace's Brother in Christ and fervent
worshipper, most humble

Gregory, Patriarch of Antiochia
and all the Orient.

City of Beyrut,
June 23/July 6, 1923
No. 860.

3. *The Church of Jerusalem.*

The epistle from Damian, Patriarch of Jerusalem, of August 27, 1925, No. 828, reading: "To those who asked me regarding the late Most Holy Tikhon, Patriarch of All-the-Russias, I wrote that he, our beloved brother in Christ, had been recognized *by me and all Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs* as the legitimate, canonical head of the Orthodox Russian Church, whom we thus recognized until the end of his earthly life—and whose name we mentioned in our divine service together with the other Orthodox Patriarchs" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* September 1-15, 1925, No. 17-18 p. 2).

Confirmation of this is found in the following reply to a letter by the author to the Patriarch of Jerusalem:

Rev. W. C. Emhardt, Ph.D.,
281 Fourth Avenue, New York.

Dear Dr. Emhardt:

With reference to your letter of December 2, 1925, on the question of the Russian Sobor of 1923, we beg to inform you that our Patriarchate does not know anything about this Sobor and has never recognized it as canonical and regular.

Invoking upon you the blessing of the Almighty and upon your work in the field of God with our best wishes we remain,

Yours faithfully in the Lord Jesus Christ
(Signed) Patriarchate of Jerusalem DAMIANOS.

Jerusalem, January 23/February 5, 1926.

4. *The Church of Cyprus.*

The epistle from Metropolitan Cyril, Archbishop of the Church of Cyprus, of March 7 (20), 1923, reading:

"In connection with the attempts to cause disorder in the canonical structure of the Russian Church, we assure Your Reverence that we, as custodians and followers of the sacred canons and customs of the Holy Orthodox Church, never recognize anything that is contrary to these canons.

"We ask you to communicate this to the Most Blessed Russian Patriarch Tikhon, for whose delivery from his present sufferings we pray to the Almighty" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* May 1-15, 1923, No. 9-10, p. 2).

The Church of Cyprus recognized Patriarch Tikhon as the sole legitimate head of the Russian Church to the end of his life, which may be seen from the epistle from the same Metropolitan Cyril dated June

6, 1925, where we read: "The ever memorable patriarch, called upon to be the Helmsman of the Ship of the Russian Church in times of indescribable lawlessness . . . proved himself worthy of his high and sacred calling . . . *throughout the course of his whole life. . . .*" (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* September 1-15, 1925, No. 17-18, p. 6).

5. *The Church of Serbia.*

a. Epistle from the Reverend Dimitri, Patriarch of Serbia, dated August 27-September 9, 1924, No. 2354:

"We authorize . . . in the most categorical manner to deny the rumor that we, in common with the remaining Eastern Patriarchs, have influenced any decision of the Patriarchal Synod at Tsargrad by which His Holiness, the All-Russian Patriarch Tikhon is supposed to be removed from the administration of the Russian Orthodox Church. This is pure invention, as not only did we ever write and counsel anything of this kind, *but we always regarded and still continue to regard His Holiness, Patriarch Tikhon, as the head of the Russian Orthodox Church,* and in this capacity we constantly mention him in the divine service" (*Tserkovnyia Vied.,* September 1-15, 1924, Nos. 17-18, p. 2).

b. Statement from the Acting President of the Prelatic Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad, Archbishop Theophanes, dated September 9 (22):

"The Patriarch of Serbia has authorized me to declare in printed form that he, the Holy Patriarch of Serbia, in reply to a request from former Metropolitan Evdokim to recognize the 'Holy Synod of the Orthodox Church' presided over by himself as the head of that Church instead of the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon, advised Evdokim to stop the Church mutiny and to acknowledge Patriarch Tikhon the sole head of the Russian Orthodox Church.[9]

6. *The Greek Church.*

The head of the Hellenic (Greek) Church, Metropolitan Chrysostom, writes to Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev on June 28-July 11, 1923, sub. No. 1944, as follows:

"We condemn unreservedly those Russian prelates who, obedient to men more than to God, created the so-called Living Church, of which the result and the consequence has been the *Moscow pseudo-Sobor,* and we deem it necessary to declare to Your Reverence that the Orthodox

[9] As the regular expert of the Serbian Prelatic Sobor, I can say that I have convinced myself from conversation with His Holiness, Patriarch Dimitri, and other members of said Sobor, that the Serbian Patriarchate still refuses to consider the decisions of the Moscow Sobor of 1923 valid and the Living (Synodal) Church as Orthodox.

Church of the divinely protected Kingdom of Greece can have no communion whatever with a *pseudo-Sobor* calling itself the Living Church and the Supreme Church Administration, *and what those organizations and establishments which may be created and elected by the pseudo-Sobor"* (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* July 1-15, 1923, No. 13-14, p. 2, and No. 15-16, pp. 4-5).

Metropolitan Chrysostom recognized Patriarch Tikhon as lawful Patriarch all the way to his death, as may be seen from his epistle dated May 15, 1925 (*Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* September 1-15, 1925, No. 17-18, p. 6).

Confirmation of this is found in the following reply by the Metropolitan of Athens to a letter of inquiry from the author:

The Archbishop of Athens and of All Greece.

Athens, January 26, 1926.

Rev. W. C. Emhardt,
281 Fourth Avenue,
New York City, N. Y.

My dear Dr. Emhardt:

With great pleasure I am answering your letter of December 2d in order to inform you that neither the Holy Synod of Greece nor any Patriarchate, as far as I know, have in any formal way accepted the Russian "Sobor" of 1923, as regular, authentic, and canonical.

In fact there is not a canonical communication between the Church of Greece and the said Russian "Sobor."

God the Almighty bless you and your active life for Christ and His Church.

The Archbishop Chrysostom.

The following certificate of the Archbishop of the Hellenic Orthodox Church of America, acting under appointment of the Patriarch of Constantinople, is the best interpretation of the attitude of that Patriarchate.

County of Queens, S.S.

Alexander Demos, being duly sworn, says: I am a Bishop of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and the Archbishop of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

I and all Orthodox Bishops have no communion with John Ked-

rovsky neither ecclesiastical nor in prayer, and because he is a schismatic we cannot recognize him not only as a Bishop but as a member of the Orthodox Church.

Sworn to before me this 24th day of March, 1928.

ALEXANDER DEMOS.

Demetrius E. Valakos.

Notary Public, Queens County, Queens Co. Clk's No. 2170, Reg. No. 4273; N. Y. Co. Clk's No. 161, Reg. No. 9090; Kings Co. Clk's No. 18, Reg. No. 9062. Term Expires March 30, 1929.

SEAL

No. 2817

State of New York }
County of Queens, } ss:

I, Edward W. Cox, clerk of the County of Queens, and also Clerk of the County and Supreme Courts of said County, the same being Courts of Record, DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT

Demetrius E. Valakos

the NOTARY PUBLIC before whom the within acknowledgment or deposition was made, was, at the time of taking the same, authorized by the laws of the State of New York to take the same and to take acknowledgments and proofs of deeds or conveyances for lands, tenements and hereditaments situate, lying and being in said State of New York, and further, that I am well acquainted with the handwriting of such Notary, and verily believe that the signature to said certificate of proof, acknowledgment or deposition is genuine, IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the seal of said County and Courts this 26th day of March, 1928.

EDWARD W. COX, Clerk.

7. *The Church of Poland.*

The Orthodox Church of Poland, likewise, refused to recognize the Sobor of 1923, which may be seen, among other things from the correspondence exchanged between its head, Metropolitan Dionsysius, with the Patriarchal *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Sergius, printed in Warsaw, in the journal *Voskresnoie Ohtenie,* 1926. (*Cf.* p. 821, No. 52, where Metropolitan Sergius is called the "Head of the Russian Orthodox Church.")

8. The illegality of the Sobor of 1923 was evident also to Roman Catholic representatives who took an interest in the fate of the Orthodox Church. Thus, on June 12, 1923, the famous Cardinal Mercier, acting

with the "blessing of the Holy Father," *i.e.,* the Pope, addressed the following letter to the King of England:

"I make bold to beg Your Majesty for aid and intercession in the name of humanity. *I am addressing a similar plea to the President of the United States.* Apparently the Soviet power is preparing for a new attack. The Sobor, which is by no means entitled to speak on behalf of the Orthodox Church, has resolved to depose the venerable Patriarch Tikhon, whose only offense has been that he has remained firm in the fulfillment of his duty and loyal to his spiritual charge as head of the Orthodox Russian Church. The purpose of these *dishonest* resolutions is obvious: the members of the Sobor had to facilitate it for the Soviet power to pronounce a capital punishment verdict against a leader who is surrounded with the reverent loyalty of the people" (*Viera I Rodina,* August, September, No. 32-33, Paris, p. 235, in the article "Rome's Silence").

Father d'Herbigny, likewise, finds it impossible to style the assemblies of 1923 and 1925 "Sobors," in view of their organization. He says: "Were it not that the word 'Sobor' was so greatly respected among the Russians, they might with more justification say that this was simply their third national congress,"[10] and we, for our own part, would add that no congress in the Orthodox Church can act as organ of ecclesiastical authority.

---

[10] *L'Aspect Religieux de Moscou,* p. 237, Paris, 1926. But the author makes a mistake in saying the same about the Sobor of 1917. He is unaware that the lower clergy and laity had no decisive vote there. This non-recognition of the Sobor of 1923 is important not only in that it comes from the most numerous, best organized, and oldest Christian Church, but also because the Orthodox Church does not oppose it unconditionally, but recognizes the efficacy of its sacrament.

PART IV

The Russian Church Since 1923

CHAPTER I. The Return of the Patriarch
CHAPTER II. Under a Locum Tenens
CHAPTER III. Program of Metropolitan Sergius

CHAPTER I

Return of the Patriarch

THE Sobor of 1923 ended with shouts of triumph. Every aim had been attained. The Living Church now awaited the trial and conviction of the Patriarch to crown the victory. They, however, did not interpret rightly Bolshevik policy. Warfare against any particular Church group was but a secondary object. Religion was the force considered most dangerous by the Soviet leaders. Religion was the basis of social ideals; and the social order must be abolished or subverted. Divide and attack; or better still, allow adversaries, nominally within the Church, to destroy each other. A popular cartoon portrayed Church leaders locked in personal conflict while a Communist looks on, convulsed with laughter.

Peace within the Orthodox Church, even the surface peace between a triumphant group and a terrified, subjected minority, could never suit the Bolsheviki. A militant minority under inspiring leadership was more to their liking. No sooner was the Sobor adjourned than *pour parlers* between the Patriarch and Government began. The whole trend of the Patriarch's activities had shown a right interpretation of the duties of a hierarch. While the country was in a state of revolution, he rightfully was loyal to his traditions and the Government under which he had been elevated to his office. When a *de facto* government was established, he was enjoined by Biblical precepts and canonical law to be loyal to the powers that be. This did not absolve him from his obligation to defend by word of reproof his nation's honor, as in his protest against the Brest-

Litovsk Treaty, or defend the integrity of the Church when sanctuaries were being despoiled. In fact protests in such cases are high expressions of loyalty.

History does not tell us all that occurred. Dr. Julius Hecker, in his sneering way, ascribes cowardice in face of certainty of conviction as the motive of the Patriarch's submission. The Patriarch, in an interview with a representative of the *Manchester Guardian,* July 15, 1923, quoted by Dr. Spinka, is reported as stating:

"I have never sought to overthrow the government. In 1918, I stood openly against some of its decrees. I am not a counter-revolutionary, in spite of the fact that some of my appeals had an anti-Soviet character. The power of the Soviet Government has greatly increased in Russia; and it has undergone various developments. We, the members of the old clergy, are not now struggling against the Soviets, but against the Living Church."

"What were the causes of your liberation and the change in the attitude of the Soviet Government toward you?"

"I am persuaded that, having studied my case, the government became convinced that I was no counter-revolutionary. It was suggested that I should make a public declaration of the fact, and I wrote a letter to say so." [1]

The letter or confession referred to reads:

"Appealing with the present declaration to the Supreme Court of the Russian Soviet Federation of Socialistic Republics, I regard it as my duty, dictated by my pastoral conscience, to declare the following:

"Having been nurtured in a monarchistic society, and until my arrest having been under the influence of anti-Soviet individuals, I was filled with hostility against the Soviet authorities, and at times my hostility passed from passivity to active measures, as in the instance of the proclamation on the occasion of the Brest-Litovsk peace in 1918, the anathematizing of the authorities in that same year, and finally, the appeal against the decree regarding the removal of church treasures in 1922. All my anti-Soviet acts, with the exception of a few inexactitudes, were stated in the act of accusation drawn up by the Supreme Court, acknowledging the correctness of the accusation of the Supreme Court and the sentence as conforming to the clauses of the criminal code, I

---

[1] *Op. cit.,* p. 253.

repent of all my actions directed against the government and petition the Supreme Court to change its sentence and to set me free.

"I declare hereby to the Soviet authorities that henceforth I am no more an enemy to the Soviet Government, and that I have completely and resolutely severed all connections with the foreign and domestic monarchists and the counter-revolutionary activity of the White Guards."[2]

Dr. Spinka finds in these a contradiction. This deduction is due doubtless to the Doctor's failure to discern the difference between opposition to a revolutionary movement and loyalty to a *de facto* government; and his failure to appreciate the ecclesiastical obligation to rebuke those in authority, in defense of the honor of the nation, or the sanctity of the Church. There is a great contrast between the loyalty and submission of the Patriarch and the servility and fawning of the Sobor.

This change in relationship did not in any way imply a change of attitude towards the Living Church or the Supreme Church Administration created in 1922 and continued by the Sobor of 1923. On July 15th he issued from the Donskoy Monastery, which continued to be his residence until death, a proclamation which deserves to be quoted in full:

"By the Grace of God, we, the humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and of all Russia, to the most reverend archpriests, reverend priests, honorable friars, and to all faithful children of the Orthodox Russian Church, peace and God's blessing.

"For over a year, because of circumstances known to all, we were barred from our pastoral duty and were unable to stand personally at the helm of (Church) government in order to preserve the traditions of the Church, hallowed by the centuries. Therefore, as soon as these circumstances arose, and in strict accordance with the decision of the Sobor (Church Council) which established the order of the Patriarch's administration in the Russian Church, and in accordance with the decree of the Holy Synod which met in our presence on 7th November, 1920, we deemed advisable for the time of our withdrawal from the conduct of affairs to convey the fullness of spiritual power to our substitute appointed by us, Agathangel, Metropolitan of Yaroslav, with the understanding that he was to convoke a second local Sobor (Church Council) of the

---

[2] *Izviestia,* No. 141, June 27, 1923.

Russian Church for the purpose of considering the supreme administration of the Church and other Church business to which, we had been told, the civil authorities did not object. The Metropolitan Agathangel agreed to undertake the commission with which we charged him. But for the reasons beyond his control he was unable to assume charge of his duties. Of this some ambitious and willful men took advantage in order to enter 'the fold not by the door but otherwise' (St. John 10: 1) and to usurp the highest clerical power of the Orthodox Russian Church which did not belong to them.

"On 18th May of last year there came to us who were then imprisoned in the Troitzkoye Podvorye (Conventual Church and House of the Holy Trinity) the priests: Vvedensky, Belkoff, and Kalinovsky (who recently unfrocked himself) and under the pretense of concern with the welfare of the Church presented to us a written application in which, complaining that because of circumstances Church affairs remained immobile, they asked us to entrust to them our offices for the purpose of putting in order the incoming correspondence. Believing this to be useful, we yielded to their importunities and wrote down the following directions upon their applications:

" 'The persons named below, *i.e.,* the priests who signed the application, are commissioned to receive and hand over to the Most Eminent Agathangel upon his arrival in Moscow the Synod's business papers, Secretary Nomeroff concurring.'

"On the strength of this direction, they were commissioned only to receive the documents and hand them over to the Metropolitan Agathangel as soon as he should arrive in Moscow. As to what they should do with the files received in case the Metropolitan Agathangel were not to come to Moscow at all, we had not given any directions, because we could not then even foresee such a possibility, but that they should in such a case substitute themselves for the Metropolitan and take their place at the head of the Church administration—for this there could be no blessing in the directions, because the authority vested in the rank of a bishop cannot be transferred to priests. Nevertheless, they declared this our order to be an act transferring to them the Church power (government) and, having made an agreement with the Bishops Antonin and Leonid, constituted themselves as the so-called Supreme Church Board. In order to justify this self-willed action, they have repeatedly, both in press and at public meetings, affirmed that they took charge of the Church administration in agreement with the Patriarch (*Pravda,* May 21, 1922), that they are members of the Supreme Church Board 'in accordance with a resolution of the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon' (Vvedensky, *The Revolution and the Church,* page 28), and that they 're-

ceived from the hands of the Patriarch himself the Supreme Administration of the Church' (*The Living Church,* No. 4-5, page 9). At a meeting held on 12th June, 1922, upon motion made by a priest that no Church reforms should be carried out, unless with the blessing of the Patriarch, the chairman of this meeting, the Bishop Antonin, declared: 'As the Patriarch has transferred his power without reservation to the Supreme Church Board, we have no need of running after him in order to obtain from him what is not his any longer' (*Izviestia,* April 16, 1922, No. 132).

"Now, then, we solemnly and in everybody's hearing from this hallowed rostrum bear witness that these statements of theirs regarding an agreement with us and the transfer by us of the powers and duties of a Patriarch of the Russian Church to a Supreme Church Board consisting of the Bishops Antonin and Leonid, the priests Vvedensky, Krasnitzky, Kalinovsky, and Belkoff, are nothing but lies and deception and that the persons mentioned seized the Church power by way of usurpation, willfully, without any lawful authority as established by the rules of our Church.

"To such as they the Holy Church metes out severe punishments. By the 16th rule of the Council of Antioch, a bishop who has departed from the lawful order, and has infringed on somebody else's diocese, even when asked to do so by the whole people, is ejected from his rank for the sin of breaking the Church canons. The persons who constituted the self-appointed Supreme Church Board in Moscow and are guilty of it before the Church have made their position even worse by consecrating bishops into unlawfully seized districts, as by so doing they brought themselves into the scope of the 35th rule of the Holy Apostles, which threatens deprival of rank to both those consecrating into somebody else's diocese and those consecrated by them.

"And how did they use the power unlawfully seized? They used it not for upbuilding the Church, but for sowing in it the seeds of destruction, for depriving of their sees the Orthodox bishops who remained true to their duty and refused them obedience, for persecuting faithful priests who in accordance with Church canons refused to obey them, for establishing everywhere the so-called Living Church, which spurned the authority of the Ecumenical Church and strove to weaken the Church discipline in order to help their own party to triumph and forcibly, without taking into account the joint voice of all the faithful, put into execution their desires. By all this they separated themselves from the only body of the Ecumenical Church and deprived themselves of the Grace of God which has its seat solely in Christ's Church. And because of this all rulings lacking the canonical succession and lawful power which ruled

the Church in our absence are null and void, and all acts and sacraments performed by bishops and priests who seceded from the Church are void of (God's) Grace and not binding, and those believing with them in prayer and sacraments not only are not hallowed, but receive blame for taking part in their sin.

"Deeply was our heart affected when confused rumors reached us of clerical disagreements, which began in the Church after our removal, of violations by the self-constituted and self-appointed Church government, of the appearance and struggles of parties, of a spirit of evil and division where a spirit of love and brotherly union (accord) should pervade. But we were unable to contribute anything but a prayer in my cell towards peace in the Church and the destruction in it of this destructive strife, until we received our liberty.

"Now then, having issued forth from the walls of imprisonment, and having acquainted ourselves in details with the situation of Church affairs, we once again invest ourselves with our Primate's authority temporarily transferred by us to our substitute, the Metropolitan Agathangel, but by reasons beyond his control not used by him, and are taking charge of our pastoral duties, fervently praying to the Master of the Church, our Lord Jesus Christ, that He should give us strength and understanding for putting in order His Church and establishing in it the spirit of peace, love, and humility. Simultaneously we call on all bishops, priests, and faithful children of the Church who, conscious of their duty, have courageously stood up for the God-established order of Church life, and ask them to give us their coöperation in the work of pacifying the Church with their advices and deeds and most of all with prayers to God the Creator of all and Provider. And those who voluntarily or involuntarily have succumbed to temptation in the present age of evil, and acknowledging the illegal authority, have seceded from religious (ecumenical) unity and from God's Grace, we beg to recognize their sin, to purify themselves by repentance, and to return into the saving bosom of the one Ecumenical Church.

"The Lord's blessing be with you all, through the prayers of God's Mother, the Holy Virgin Mary, of our Holy Fathers Peter, Alexis, Iona, Philip Hermogen, of Moscow Holy-men and miracle-workers, and of all the Saints of the Russian land, God-fearing through the ages. Amen.

"The humble TIKHON, Patriarch of
Moscow and All Russians.

"Moscow, Don Monastery, Year 1923, July 15th."[8]

[8] Translated by V. E. Greaves, L.G. This is also reprinted in Russian in the *American Orthodox Messenger,* No. 13, July 30, 1923.

The following account by one well acquainted with Russia is a most helpful interpretation of this letter:

"A group of the Patriarch's friends from personal conversations with him have furnished a precise account of the circumstances under which the statement of the Patriarch was made:

"Two weeks before the printing of his avowal something strange happened to the Patriarch. After the five o'clock tea he suddenly began to vomit and after that he fainted for a prolonged time. A great many people think that the Patriarch was poisoned with fish that he had the same day for his dinner (at two o'clock afternoon). But the Patriarch himself does not agree with this version, but believes that he had a slight attack of apoplexy on account of irregular digestion and other causes. He did not regain his senses during an hour and a half, and when he revived he felt a great weakness and heaviness in his body on the right side, but this state did not last long. It is necessary to mention that during the year of his arrest he has grown much thinner and older by ten years. Just after this event the Soviet Government, surmising that there was in this case an attempt to poison the Patriarch, and seeking to void the repetition of such an attempt, transferred the Patriarch from the Donskoy Monastery to the G. P. U. (State Political Administration.) During the stay of the Patriarch at the G. P. U., the authorities proposed to him to acknowledge the Soviet Government, promising after this acknowledgment a great deal of good for the Church, such as: the absolute liberty of the Church, the liberation of the arrested, etc.

"Feeling himself not in the right to be the cause of further imprisonment of a great many of the Orthodox, and in the hope to bring peace to the Church with the help of the Soviet Government, the Patriarch acknowledged it. But the Orthodox people feel instinctively that in the acknowledgment of the Soviet Government by the Patriarch is hidden something that cannot be revealed just now, and that the Patriarch accomplished this action exclusively in the interests of the Church. There are yet a great many of the people among the bishops and clericals, also among the laymen, ready to withdraw from him, but the greatest majority of the Orthodox are on the side of the Patriarch, as it clearly appeared on the 1st of July, when the Patriarch officiated the first liturgy at the Donskoy Monastery after his liberation. Such a large number of faithful came to assist at the service (not regarding that the Donskoy Monastery is situated on the far end of the city) that not only the church but also the immense yard overflowed with people. As the church was able to enclose but an insignificant part of the faithful, the Patriarch officiated a *Te Deum* in the yard, after which he was blessing the crowd during several hours.

"In the church the Patriarch addressed himself to the assembled. He spoke about the necessity for the Church to throw aside all political questions. The problem of the Church, he said, was to sow the teaching of Christ about the peace of the whole world, about fraternity, about the victorious love so greatly wanted just now by the passionately boiling human sea, and the Church is obliged to fulfil her essential problem.

"In private conversation with his intimates, the Patriarch advanced that his nearest problem was the restitution of the Church's peace and the abolishment of the schism; and after he gained the Church's peace he would assemble a clerical council, to which he will give an account of his behavior.

"My conversations with many Orthodox Christians corroborates the above statement that the great majority are giving their support to the Patriarch however much shocked at first with the announcement that brought his release, believing that he is right in estimating his first duty to be the reclamation of the Church from the hands of the usurpers. More illuminating, if technical, is the analysis of the Patriarch's action by a most learned professor. This is appended as Exhibit F. It is reported to me, and altogether to be expected, that there is an element of unreconstructible monarchists, still holding out for a Restoration, who would use the Church as an instrument, who are permanently estranged from the Patriarch by this action. I found none who attributed the Patriarch's action to any consideration of himself. General recognition is given to the extreme humiliation to which he was willing to subject himself for the welfare of the Church. His appearance now as compared with one year ago tells tragically the spiritual suffering he has passed through, but the rare beauty and dignity of his character are still further enhanced. He is acting with vigor.

"As already quoted, the popular response to his appearance as leader was instant and impressive. One might even term it overwhelming. Invitations to celebrate the service in churches called him into daily activity. It was stated in July that he had invitations for each day until October. The service I attended was on a Saturday morning, due to begin at ten o'clock. I arrived there exactly on the hour, but found the church packed as only Russian congregations can fill a place. A considerable crowd pressed on the outside unable to gain entrance. Fortunately, the American journalist accompanying me and I were recognized as foreigners and the word was passed ahead of us through the crowd to the doorway and on into the church that here were strangers. By this characteristic Russian courtesy we were enabled to squeeze ourselves in and make our way nearly to the celebrant. During these days priests that had gone with the Living Church were making confession to the Patri-

arch for their error and on the following Sunday publicly recanting to their congregations. Before mid-summer certain leaders of the Living Church were alarmed and some greatly depressed by the movement away from them. One declared that the Living Church was sleeping. Mr. Duranty, correspondent for the New York *Times,* in a dispatch a few weeks later states that the Patriarch's plan to call an authoritative council is maturing; that the government is consenting even to the return of many of the émigré clergy for the occasion, affording them opportunity to make their peace with the government and take their place in the life of the Church in Russia. I was informed reliably last month that only two churches in Moscow remain to the Living Church."

The fat was now in the fire. The Supreme Administration was forced to a vigorous defensive which took the form of noisy aggression. They combatted the Patriarch as lacking authority, and for his failure to call a Sobor in 1921, notwithstanding the impediments created by the government. His trial was justified, even though not tried by his peers—the other Patriarchs. They quote in their defense Article 10 of the enactments of the Sobor of 1917 defining the office of a patriarch: "In case the patriarch should infringe the rights or duties of his office . . . he shall be tried by an All-Russian Sobor of bishops, to which, as far as possible, the other patriarchs and representatives of autocephalous Churches shall be invited; in such a case the indictment as well as the condemnatory verdict requires not less than two-thirds of effective votes." They fail, however, to quote Article 8 of the same enactments: "Should the patriarch fail in his duties, then in accordance with the nature of the failure, the three eldest members of the Holy Synod or members of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of archiepiscopal rank shall make a brotherly representation to the patriarch; in case this should have no result, they shall make a second representation, and in case this also is fruitless, they shall adopt further measures in accordance with Article 10."[4]

Failing to overcome the growing strength of the patri-

[4] *Regulations About the Supreme and Eparchal Administration of the Orthodox Church.* Warsaw, 1922, p. 5.

archal party, the leaders of the Supreme Church Administration began to quarrel among themselves. In order to avoid the disrepute into which the group was falling, in August, 1923, the majority of the three groups represented in the Sobor of 1923 formed a new coalition organization of radicals. In order to seem more regular and appealing to the outside world, they changed the name of the Supreme Church Administration to Holy Synod of the Orthodox Russian Church, henceforth styling themselves the Synodical Church. The Metropolitan Antonin was displaced by Archbishop Evdokim (formerly Archbishop of North America), of Nizhni Novgorod. This new movement gained a semblance of strength through quasi-recognition by the Patriarchate of Constantinople. Even if this be so, it in no way applies to the Sobor of 1923; and arose partly from misunderstanding and partly from expediency arising from duress, which had to govern the foreign policies of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. The whole subject is fully discussed in Part III, Chapter 5. In July, 1923, the Ecumenical Patriarch Meletius IV stated that the Congress of the Orthodox expressed its sorrow for the calamities that had befallen the Patriarch. This was followed by like expression by the Patriarch Demetrius of Serbia, and Gregory of Antioch. The writer received personal letters from the Metropolitan Chrysostomos of Greece, Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev, and Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, condemning the Sobor, and has in his possession a letter addressed by the Patriarch of Antioch to Metropolitan Platon to the same effect.[6]

Shortly afterwards, affairs of the Orthodox Church in Turkey became more involved. Not only did the Turkish Government give early recognition to the Soviet Government, but about the same time placed restrictions upon the Patriarchate. From this environment the successor of Meletius, Gregory VII, reversed the decision, and caused the Synod to recom-

---

[6] These letters are to be found in Part III, Chapter 5.

mend appointment of a commission. Among the instructions to be given this commission we find the following clauses:

"That the commission convey in an appropriate manner the view of the most Holy Synod relative to the necessity of removal of the most holy Patriarch Tikhon, and the abolition, even if only temporary, of the patriarchate in the U. S. S. R.; the commission shall organize its work accordingly.

"That it make known the view of the Ecumenical Patriarch that the new regulation regarding the Supreme Church Administration must be based upon foundations of purely conciliar ecclesiastical principles, and must have the form of a freely and canonically elected Conciliar Synod."

To this the Patriarch Tikhon wrote in reply:

"Having perused the above-mentioned protocols, we were not a little saddened, as well as amazed, that the representative of the ecumenical patriarchate, the head of the Constantinopolitan Church, without any preparatory correspondence with us as the lawful representative and head of the whole Russian Church, should intrude himself into the life and affairs of the autocephalous Russian Church. The holy Sobors (*cf.* the 2d and 3d rules of the Second Ecumenical Council, and others) ever acknowledged in the past, as well as now, that the Constantinopolitan bishop possesses a preëminence of honor above other autocephalous Churches, but not of authority. We also recall that rule which specifies that 'when not invited, bishops must not go outside the limits of their territory to consecrate another, or for any other ecclesiastical function.' Hence any attempt of any commission whatsoever without reference to me, as the sole legal and orthodox primate of the Russian Orthodox Church, is illegal without my authorization, and will not be received by the Orthodox Russian people, and will result not in pacification, but in a still greater disturbance and schism in the life of the already heavily afflicted Russian Orthodox Church. In the end, it will be beneficial only to our schismatical new-Churchmen, whose leaders now at the head of the so-called (self-styled) Holy Synod, as the former Archbishop of Nizhni-Novgorod, Evdokim, and others, are deprived by me of their priestly office, and 'till further disposition,' on account of the disturbance, schism, and illegal seizure of ecclesiastical government which they effected, are pronounced to be outside the fellowship of the Orthodox Church." [6]

---

[6] *Tzerkovnya Vedomosti* [*The Ecclesiastical Journal*], Karlowitz, No. 7, 8, 1925.

Despite this, the Patriarchate, under Constantine VI and Basil III, continued to recognize the pseudo Holy Synod. In August 25, 1925, the Patriarch of Jerusalem had strongly endorsed the Patriarch Tikhon. However, it must be remembered that the Patriarch of Jerusalem had been largely supported by the bounty of Russian pilgrims, and that a large part of the endowment of the Patriarchate came from Russian estates. This may account for the change in policy of the Patriarch, now a very old man, who in July 1926 recognized the pseudo Synod. The Patriarchs of Serbia and Antioch have refused to reverse their decisions.

It must always be borne in mind that free intercourse with the outside world was permitted the Synodal Church, but was denied the Patriarchal Church; and that when official visits of ecclesiastics were made they could approach the Renovated with freedom, while exchange of formal courtesies with the Patriarchal group was attended with difficulties and grave dangers to both parties. When Father d'Herbigny of the Roman Communion visited Moscow in 1925, he was permitted to mingle with the Synodalists but could not procure interviews with leaders of the Patriarchal Church. It is for this reason that his book on the Russian Church and his magazine articles are so favorable to the "Renovated" group.[7]

In order to give the appearance of orthodoxy and regularity before these new friends as well as in hope of reclaiming lost adherents, the Synodical Party held many of the decisions of the Sobor of 1923 in reserve. Let us again quote Dr. Spinka:

> "The Holy Synod found it expedient to adopt a policy of moderation in regard to the method of execution of some of the reformatory legislation passed by the second Sobor; for instance, in the matter of the married episcopate, which had caused so much opposition, and had resulted in serious losses to the movement by reason of the charges of uncanonicity and even of heresy, the new administration did not, indeed, abandon the principle of the legislation, but adopted a policy of procras-

[7] D'Herbigny, *L'Aspect Religieux de Moscow en Octobre 1925*, and Meuse, *Irenikon*, published at Amay, Belgium.

tination in putting it into effect. Wherever the innovation would cause offense to the masses, the Synod desisted from forcing the matter. The whole question was likewise referred to the next (eighth) Ecumenical Council for a final settlement, and the Synod professed to be entirely ready and willing to accept the disposition of the question by the Council. The same policy was adopted regarding the second marriage of clerics and the introduction of the Gregorian calendar: wherever signs of restiveness in regard to the innovations appeared among the people, the matter was dropped, and thus the parishes were practically given a local option to accept or reject the reforms. These opportunist policies were productive of greater stabilization of the position of the Holy Synod."[8]

He then gives the following interesting piece of internal history:

"An interesting episode was the reception of the leader of the Living Church, probably the most radical of the former reformist personalities, back into the patriarchal fold, and the positively astounding circumstance that from the beginning he was granted a leading place on the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of Patriarch Tikhon. On May 19, 1924, Tikhon sent a resolution to his Synod, in which he informed them:

" 'For the sake of peace and weal of the Church, in manifestation of my patriarchal clemency, I agree to receive back into fellowship Protopresbyter V. Krasnitsky. I submit to the Holy Synod the question of his admittance into the membership of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council.'

"This interesting document was passed upon by the patriarchal Synod on May 21st, and Krasnitsky found himself a veritable member of the organization which he, more than anybody else, perhaps, helped to undermine. However, he did not permanently remain a member of it."[9]

The Synodical or Living Church party seized every opportunity to strengthen its position. In February 1925, they succeeded in winning over Metropolitan Benjamin of Leningrad, one of the eldest of the pre-revolutionary prelates, whom they placed at the head of their Holy Synod in the stead of Archbishop Evdokim. They also followed the example of the government in meeting the Nationalistic aspirations of various parts of the Republic by recognizing as autonomous Churches

[8] Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 280. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 281.

radical groups in the Ukraine, Siberia, the Far East, White Russia, North America, and Western Europe.

At this juncture a great blow befell the Patriarchal party by the death of Patriarch Tikhon, April 7, 1925.

Dr. Spinka, after a careful study of the patriarchate of Tikhon, makes this statement:

> "Those who knew Patriarch Tikhon's life after his release from prison bear testimony to the fact that he honestly kept the promise made at that time no longer to continue the anti-governmental policies of the earlier period of his administration. This is the witness of no less an authority than the vice-president of the U. S. S. R., Peter G. Smidovich, in charge of the department of ecclesiastical affairs, given in a personal interview with the writer. He summed up his judgment of Tikhon by saying that he was an honorable man who kept his promise, but his associates were not in sympathy with that policy and often were able to circumvent the Patriarch's intention. Smidovich said that at first he had mistrusted the Patriarch, but after he held a personal interview with him, he became convinced of the honesty of Tikhon's personal intentions."

The Patriarch left his last bequest to the Church, a so-called will in which he reiterates his expressions of loyalty to the government under which God had ordained that he should serve and suffer; and urged all hierarchs to become faithful and loyal servants of their government.

CHAPTER II

Under a Locum Tenens

IN December 1924 the Patriarch Tikhon wrote directions designating as his temporary successor, in the order named, the Metropolitan Cyril, the Metropolitan Agathangel, the Metropolitan Peter of Krutitsky. The surviving bishops who could be brought together found that it would be impossible to bring either Cyril or Agathangel to Moscow, and chose Metropolitan Peter as *locum tenens* of the Patriarchate. According to canons the election of a Patriarch should occur forty days after the death of the former Patriarch. This was, of course, impossible. Most of the regular bishops were in exile or in prison. There was also grave doubt whether the government would grant permission to the Orthodox to call a Sobor, inasmuch as a Sobor of the Living Church was in contemplation.

The Living Church leaders took advantage of the weakness of the position of the *locum tenens* to invite him and his followers to their Sobor. While the terms of the appeal were most generous, the synodical group failed to understand that even a gracious invitation could not be accepted, if it implied recognition of a group that was uncanonical in polity and policy. They surely should have recognized, as the Metropolitan pointed out in a private interview with some of their leaders, that a *locum tenens* could not speak for his followers after the manner of a Patriarch. A more formal invitation, however, was extended in June of the same year.

Following this, the Metropolitan issued what Dr. Spinka describes with his usual fairness as "an excellent statement of

the case of the patriarchal party, and it may readily be granted that, from the canonical point of view, it is not only formidable, but positively unanswerable. If canonical considerations alone were to decide upon the merits of the two parties, the patriarchal party would easily secure the victory." [1]

Referring to the proposed reunion the Metropolitan says:

"At the present time the so-called new-Churchmen more and more discuss the matter of reunion with us. They call meetings in cities and villages, and invite Orthodox clerics and laymen to a common adjudication of the question of reunion with us, and to prepare for their pseudo-Sobor which they are calling for the autumn of this year. But it must be clearly recalled that according to the canonical rules of the Ecumenical Church, such arbitrarily gathered councils as were the meetings of the Living Church in 1923, are illegal. Hence the canonical rules forbid Orthodox Christians to take part in them and much more to elect representatives for such gatherings. In accordance with the 20th rule of the Council of Antioch, 'no one is permitted to call a Council alone, without those bishops who are in charge of the metropolitanates.' In the holy Church of God only that is lawful which is approved by the God-ordained ecclesiastical government, preserved by succession since the time of the apostles. All arbitrary acts, everything that was done by the new-Church party without the approval of the most holy Patriarch now at rest with God, everything that is now done without our approval—of the guardian of the patriarchal throne, acting in conjunction with all lawful Orthodox hierarchy—all this has no validity in accordance with the canons of the holy Church (An., rule 34; Antioch, rule 9), for the true Church is one, and the grace of the most holy Spirit residing in it is one, for there can be no two Churches or two graces. 'There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord; one faith, one God and Father of all' (Eph. 4:4-6).

"The so-called new-Churchmen should talk of no reunion with the Orthodox Church until they show a sincere repentance of their errors. The chief of these errors is that they had arbitrarily renounced the lawful hierarchy and its head, the most holy Patriarch, and attempted to reform the Church of Christ by self-invented teaching (*The Living Church,* No. 1-11); they had transgressed the ecclesiastical rules which were established by Ecumenical Councils (the pronouncements of the pseudo-Sobor of May 4, 1923); they had rejected the government of the Patriarch, which was established by the Sobor and acknowledged by all

[1] *Op. cit.,* p. 299.

Eastern Orthodox Patriarchs, *i.e.,* they had rejected what all Orthodoxy accepted, and besides, they had even condemned him at their pseudo-Sobor. Contrary to the rules of the holy Apostles, Ecumenical Councils, and the holy Fathers (Apostolic rules 17, 18; Sixth Ecumenical Council, rules 3, 13, 48; St. Basil the Great, rule 12), they permit the bishops to marry and the clerics to contract a second marriage, *i.e.,* they transgress what the entire Ecumenical Church acknowledges to be a law, which can be changed solely by an Ecumenical Council.

"The reunion of the so-called new-Churchmen with the holy Orthodox Church is possible only on the condition that each of them recants his errors and submits to a public repentance for his apostasy from the Church. We pray the Lord God without ceasing that He may restore the erring into the bosom of the holy Orthodox Church."[2]

The so-called third Sobor convened October 11, 1925, under the presidency of Bishop Benjamin. An official effort was made to persuade Metropolitan Peter to join issue with them. His reply was substantially the same as that just quoted. The Sobor could but express its regret at his obstinacy and repeat the old accusation of monarchical leanings. Referring to further acts of the Sobor, Dr. Spinka gives this concise summary:

"As the second distinct affirmation of the Sobor of 1925, a general approval of the actions taken on the part of the reformist groups in the matter of retirement of Patriarch Tikhon in 1922 was voted, and the organization of the Supreme Church Administration was pronounced 'legal,' and the Sobor of 1923 convoked by this administration was affirmed likewise 'canonical and legal.' But the next paragraph of this same pronouncement speaks volumes regarding the changes of orientation which had occurred in the leading personalities of the synodical party since the days when the reformist groups were in the saddle; it was specifically stated that:

" 'The Holy Sobor regards it as necessary to declare that the Orthodox Church, headed by the Holy Synod, definitely separates itself from such irresponsible ecclesiastical groups and representatives as is Protopresbyter Krasnitsky, who a long time ago left the main ecclesiastical channel, or Bishop Antonin, who likewise for a long period had no relationship with the Holy Synod; and the Holy Synod is responsible neither for their representations or actions, nor for their dishonoring of the dignity of the ecclesiastical order.'

---

[2] *American Orthodox Messenger,* No. 8, August, 1925, pp. 51-52.

"Strong words, those, to be officially spoken about the former leaders of the reformist movement!

"Of very great importance were the decisions regarding the canonicity of the married episcopate: the third Sobor, in the first place, confirmed the decisions of the second Sobor in placing the married episcopate on an equality with the unmarried, and likewise permitted the clerics to enter a second marriage; furthermore, it was affirmed that these matters were within the jurisdiction of a local (national) Sobor, and thus no illegality whatever had been committed by the second Sobor in dealing with the matter; nevertheless, 'the Holy Synod' at the same time holds it its duty to present the decisions regarding this subject of the Sobors of 1923 and 1925 for the consideration of the coming Ecumenical Council, and expresses its readiness to submit to the decision of that Council, in so far as that decision shall be binding upon all Orthodox Churches." [3]

The charges of disloyalty against the Metropolitan Peter were pressed. These led to his arrest and trial. Although the evidence against him has never been published, he was subsequently tried and exiled to Siberia.

While in prison, the Metropolitan Peter delegated the authority vested in him by the Patriarch Tikhon to the Metropolitan Sergius of Nishni Novgorod. The majority of the Patriarchal party accepted him as their leader. Although not permitted to leave Nishni Novgorod, he continues to exercise that office in a most acceptable manner. He has endeavored to keep before the Church its duty to the government and at the same time keep clear the ancient traditions of his Church. He vigorously denounced the Sobor of 1923 and pronounced the Synodical Church uncanonical but not heretical. He assured the government that his followers were absolutely loyal.

The following statements, translated by M. J. Petchkovsky, fully explain his position:

"Metropolitan Sergius, the new *locum tenens* of the Patriarch's throne in Russia, in his letter to one reformist Bishop *(Living Churchman)* has precisely and clearly formulated the attitude of the Patriarch's Church toward the 'reformers' formerly headed by the 'red' Holy Synod

[3] Spinka, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

of the Metropolitan Evdokim. Let me quote some more important passages from this interesting document:

"Governing ourselves by the rules of our Holy Church and taking in mind the history of the origin of the Supreme Church Council (even though 'not without the knowledge of the Patriarch' as you have written, yet in any event without his blessing and assent), we, the Orthodox people, are considering the reformers, *i.e.,* the society headed by the Holy Synod (Moscow, Troitzkoye Podvorye on the Samotek) as a 'self-styled' body (1st rule of Basil the Great) which split off from the unity of the Holy Church in sake of causes and ends that have a little in common with the religious ones.

"The interchange of letters between the reformers and the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem cannot make lawful and canonic this 'self-styled body.'

". . . if the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem have come into communion with the renovators, be it worse for the Patriarch. Everybody is equal before the Divine law, both Patriarch and laity. When the Patriarch of Constantinople fell off into the union with Rome in the fifteenth century, the Russian Church did not follow after him and the Roman Catholic priests in Russia did not become in this way Orthodox priests. Just in the same way the communion between the Constantinopolitan Patriarch with the renovators may make but the Patriarch a renovator, and so, the renovators make Orthodox people.

"Metropolitan Sergius has reminded us, however, that the Holy Patriarch Tikhon had not hurried to pronounce a condemnation and that only gradually such situation was created at which 'we consider all renovating bishops and clergy as being under suspension and we hold invalid *chirotonies* (ordinations) performed by them and other holy orders (except baptism).

"The Patriarch's Church is, however, ready to receive unto her bosom those who have repented. The reception of such clergy from the renovating movement, as Metropolitan Sergius has written, 'shall be made in such a way as any reception from any sect in general: through a public repentance and the condemnation of the renovating 'self-styled body' and of their participation therein, and through the recognition of the single canonical head of the Russian Church, the Patriarch of Moscow and his *locum tenens* and through the promise of an immutable fidelity and obedience to the Holy Church until the last gasp . . ."[4]

Notwithstanding this, the Metropolitan was arrested late

[4] Quoted and translated from the Russian daily in Paris, *Poslednya Novosti,* of August 12, 1927, No. 2333.

in 1927. He was succeeded successively by Metropolitan Joseph of Nishni Novgorod, Archbishop Cornelius of Ekaterinburg, and Thaddeus of Astrokhan, all of whom were later put under arrest. This was but a continuation of a program, to which the Soviet unswervingly adhered, of arrest, imprisonment, and exile to all prelates not subservient to its will. A letter printed in the Russian Emigrant press in July 1927 gives the names and sees of 117 exiled bishops, adding that no trace can be found of 40 others. It was further stated without denial by the Supreme Church Administration that in every case accusation or denunciation was made by one of the Renovated clergy.[5]

On the other hand, members of the Synodical Church, although viewed with contempt by Soviet leaders, suffer no repression. They publish official journals and are permitted to give public lectures on religious topics. In fact, Metropolitan Vvedensky has debated publicly against the Bolsheviks. All this has been denied the followers of the Patriarch Tikhon.

Late in 1927 a change occurred in the Soviet attitude towards the old Church. Metropolitan Sergius was released from prison July 29th, and soon afterwards the Synod under the Metropolitan was formally recognized by the government. A concordat was evidently made, but the conditions remain hidden. Evidently he enjoys the confidence of the government, and has been permitted to issue the following encyclical, in which, following the example of the Patriarch, he accords to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, but to God the things that are God's.

"By the Grace of God we, the humble Sergius, Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod, substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens,* and the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod, to the Most Reverend Archpriests, God-loving priests, honorable friars, and to all faithful children of the All-Russian Orthodox Church, peace and God's blessing.

"Among other cares of the late Patriarch Tikhon, our Most Holy Father, before his death, it was one that our Orthodox Russian Church

[5] *Poslednya Novosti,* Paris, July 22, 1927.

be placed under the right relations towards the Soviet Government and that she be given in this way an opportunity of an entirely legal and peaceful existence. On his deathbed the Most Holy said: 'I wish I could live some three years more.' Should not his unexpected death have stopped his prelatic works, surely, he would have brought his cause to its end. Unfortunately, various events and chiefly the public activities of the abroad residing foes of the Soviet Government, among whom there were not only average believers of our Church, but also their leaders, would have aroused a natural and righteous mistrust of the government against Church workers in general and hampered the efforts of the Most Holy who had failed to see his efforts crowned with success while alive.

"Now, the lot of being the provisional substitute for the first prelate in our Church has fallen upon me, the unworthy Metropolitan Sergius, and together with it, the duty to continue the cause of the late in seeking by all means for a peaceful arrangement of the affairs of our Church. My efforts in this direction shared with me by the Orthodox archpastors seem not to be fruitless: with the stablishment of the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod the hope is strengthened that all our Church administration would be put in a due arrangement and a right order. The assurance is growing also of a peaceful life and our activities within the protection of law.

"While we are now almost at the very aim of our aspiration, the public activities of the abroad foes do not cease: murders, acts of arson, raids, explosions, and the like which are going on here in the subterranean struggle before our eyes.

"All these disturb the peaceful current of life and create the atmosphere of a mutual mistrust and suspicions of every kind. The more our Church needs and the more it is binding upon everybody among ourselves for whom her interests are dear and who are anxious to bring her out to the road of a legal and peaceful existence, the more it is now binding upon ourselves to show that we Church workers keep not with the foes of our Soviet State, nor with their insane weapons of their intrigues, but that we are with our people and with our government.

"To testify this is the first goal of our present epistle (my own and that of the Synod). Further we wish to let you know that in May of the current year a Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod was formed near the Substitute upon my invitation and with the permission of the government. It is composed of the undersigned members. There are still absent the Right Reverend Metropolitan Arseny of Novgorod, who has not yet arrived, and the Archbishop of Kostroma, Sebastianus, who is ill. Our application that the Synod be permitted to begin their activities in the administration of the Orthodox All-Russian Church

have been crowned with success. At the time our Orthodox Church within the Union enjoys a perfectly legal existence under the civil laws central administration; and we hope that the legalization will gradually be extended to our interior Church administration: diocesan, districtal, and so on. We need no comment upon the importance and all effects of the change in the standing of our Orthodox Church, of her clergy, of all Church workers and institutions, which is made in this way. Let us bring up our thanksgiving prayers to the God who has been so benevolent to our Holy Church. Let us express before the whole nation our gratitude to the Soviet Government for this their attention to the spiritual needs of the Orthodox population. Let us simultaneously assure the government that we shall not abuse their confidence extended to us.

"In commencing our synodal work with the blessing of God, we are clearly conscious of the whole magnitude of the task which is before ourselves as well as before all representatives of the Church in general. We ought to show not by our words but by our acts that not only people indifferent to the orthodoxy, not only traitors thereof, but also the most zealous adherents of same for whom it is dear as truth and life with all its dogmas and traditions, with all its canonic and god-worshipping structure, may be faithful citizens of the Soviet Union, loyal to the Soviet Government. We wish to be Orthodox but at the same time to recognize the Soviet Union as our civil fatherland, whose joys and fortunes are ours, whose failures are also ours. Any blow directed against the Union, be it a war, boycott, some public disaster, or simply a murder from the corner like that in Warsaw, is conceived by ourselves as a blow directed against ourselves. As Orthodox people we do not forget our duty to be the citizens of the Union 'not only for wrath, but also for conscience's sake' as the Apostle has taught us (Rom. 13:5). Moreover, we hope that with God's help and your common coöperation and support, this task will be solved by us. The only thing that may obstruct our work is the same that had prevented the establishment of the life of the Church on the principle of loyalty during the first years of the Soviet Government. We mean that we lack an adequate comprehension how much is serious that has happened in our country. Many people believed that the establishment of the Soviet Government was a misunderstanding of some kind, a mere occurrence, and hence something short-coming. The people have forgotten that there are no mere occurrences for the Christian, and that in what is being done with us, the right hand of God is working as it does everywhere and every time. It infallibly leads every nation to the goal predestinated for that nation. Such people who do not desire to understand 'the sign of the epoch,' may believe that it is impossible to break away with the former régime and even with

the monarchy without breaking off with the orthodoxy. Such frame of minds of certain Church circles, shown, indeed, both by words and by acts, brought about the suspicions of the Soviet Government and hindered the efforts of the Most Holy Patriarch in establishing peaceful relations between the Church and the Soviet Government. It is, indeed, not in vain that the Apostle has suggested that we may lead a quiet and a peaceable life in our piety when we obey the lawful authority only (I Tim., 2: 2), or otherwise we must go out of the society. Only dreamers may dream in their libraries that such a huge society as our Orthodox Church, with all organization thereof, may exist in a State quietly by hiding herself from the government. Now, when our Patriarchate, in carrying out the will of the late Patriarch, is resolutely and irrevocably entering upon the road of loyalty, the people of the frame of minds aforesaid ought either to overcome themselves, to leave their political sympathies at home, to bring into the Church nothing but faith, and to coöperate with us in the name of the faith. Or, unless they are able to overcome themselves at once, at least not to hinder us and keep off from any interference with the affairs for some time. We are sure that they will very soon come back again to coöperate with us as soon as they will have convinced themselves that only the attitude toward the government has changed, but the faith and the Orthodox Christian life has remained immutable.

"The problem of the clergy who had gone abroad together with the emigrants has received peculiar acuteness under the given circumstances. Some public activities of our certain archpastors and pastors conspicuously directed against the Soviet had compelled the late Patriarch to dismiss the Synod acting abroad (May 5-April 22, 1922), but the Synod keeps existing up to date. It has not undergone any change as to its political line. Moreover, it recently succeeded by its claims for the control in splitting the Church society abroad over two camps. To bring this to an end we have ordered that the clergy abroad give a written promise of their unreserved loyalty to the Soviet Government in all their public activities. Those who have failed to give such promise or who have broken same shall be excluded from the records of the clergy subjected to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate. We believe that after dispensing in this way, we shall be protected against any emergency from abroad. On the other hand, our resolution will perhaps make other people pause and think over if the time has come also for them to reconsider the problem on their own attitude toward the Soviet Government in order not to break off with their parent Church and fatherland.

"We consider as equally important our task to prepare the convocation and the convocation itself of our second territorial Sobor, which

shall elect not a provisional but permanent central Church administration and render a decision on all the 'thieves of the power' in the Church who have been parting the garments of Christ. The method and the time of the convocation, as well as the program of the Sobor and other details, shall be wrought out later on. Let us express now our firm conviction that our eventual Sobor shall have found a solution of many painful problems in our inward Church life and simultaneously shall give with their collective wisdom and vote their final approval to the cause of establishing normal relations between our Church and the Soviet Government, which cause we have undertaken.

"In conclusion, we eagerly beg all of you, Right Reverend Archpastors, Pastors, Brothers, and Sisters: help ourselves by your compassion and coöperation in our toil, by your zeal for the cause of God, by your devotion and obedience to the Holy Church, and particularly by your prayers to God for us, that He grant us successfully and agreeably to Him to achieve the cause imposed upon us to the glory of His Holy Name, to the benefit of our Holy Orthodox Church, and to our common salvation.

"Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and love of God and Father and communion of Holy Ghost be with all of you. Amen.

"July 16/29, 1927. City of Moscow.

"For the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens,* SERGIUS,

"Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod.

"Members of the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod: Seraphym, Metropolitan of Tver, Silvester, Archbishop of Vologda, Alexy, Archbishop of Khutynsk, Acting Ruler of the Diocese of Novgorod, Anatholy, Archbishop of Samara, Paul, Archbishop of Viatka, Philipp, Archbishop of Zvenigorod, Acting Ruler of the Diocese of Moscow, Constantine, Bishop of Sumy, Acting Ruler of the Diocese of Kherson." [6]

It is most significant to note that towards the close of the encyclical he announces his intention of preparing for and convoking a *second* local Sobor. In these words the Soviet Government permits the Metropolitan to proclaim to the world by a document released with official consent, that the Sobor of 1923 was but a Sobor of a faction; and that now, with official permission, the Sobor promised in 1917 will be held as the second Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church.

[6] Translated by M. J. Petchkovsky.

CHAPTER III

The Program of Metropolitan Sergius

MENTION already has been made of the conditions under which the Metropolitan Sergius entered upon his duties as *Vice-Locum Tenens* of the Patriarch. After his release from prison he seems to have devoted his efforts to the creation of a modus vivendi between the Patriarchal Synod and the Soviet Government. It is necessary again to point out that the recognition of the civil power by a Church exercising jurisdiction in a country is but a continuation of the policy growing out of the injunctions of Holy Scriptures. Submission even to unholy rule in all things not in conflict with obedience to God and His Church is very different from the servility of The Living Church or the Synodical Church's which delights in expressions of adulation to the Soviet rule and its sponsors.

It is through this tactful, and, on the whole, Christian attitude toward the government, that the Metropolitan Sergius has won a favorable attitude of the government towards the Patriarchal Synod and religion in general, despite the fear and clamor of the "godless" group. It has been possible for him to reëstablish the Sacred Synod with Soviet approval, and to transmit details of its organization to the outside world. This information was conveyed to the Metropolitan Eulogius in the following ukase, May 5, 1927:

The Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius,
Ruler of the Russian Orthodox Churches in the Western Europe.

Acting *Locum Tenens* of the Patriarch's Throne and the Provisional Patriarch's Synod attached to him have heard an inquiry of May 20th,

this year, No. 22-4603-62, issued by the Administrative Department of the People's Commissariat of Interior, as follows:

"The application of the Acting *Locum Tenens* of the Moscow Patriarch's Throne," Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod Sergius, civil name Stargorodsky, and the list of the so-called Patriarch's Sacred Synod, provisionally formed near him and composed of: Metropolitan of Novgorod Arseny Stadnitsky, Metropolitan of Tver Seraphimus Alexandroff, Archbishop of Vologda Sylvester Bratanovsky, Archbishop of Khutynalexy Simansky, Archbishop of Kostroma Sebastianus Vesty, Archbishop of Zvenigorod Philipp Gumilevsky, and Bishop of Sumy Constantine Diakov, have been received and noticed in the Administrative Department of the Central Administrative Board of the People's Commissariat of Interior. No objection that this body proceed with their activities prior to the confirmation of same" (signature, seal).

Note: At a preliminary Conference held by the Acting *Locum Tenens* jointly with the Archbishops invited by him (all the above mentioned, except Metropolitan Arseny) the following oral proposition of the Acting *Locum Tenens* was heard on May 18th:

"Being conscious of the necessity of having near me, as the Provisional Substitute for the Chief Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church, an auxiliary body in the form of the Sacred Synod established by the resolution of the Sobor of 1917-1918, I have resolved to follow the deceased Most Holy Patriarch and to form near me such Synod by inviting certain Right Reverend Archpastors whose participation in the work of the Synod have seemed to me as possible and useful. Among those who are present here, the Right Reverend Metropolitan of Novgorod Arseny had also been invited. Unfortunately, because of his moving from his residence, the letter mailed to his old address apparently is detained en route, and no answer from Metropolitan Arseny has been received. To avoid any misunderstanding, I deem it needful to make a reservation that the Synod planned near me in no degree is qualified to replace the heading of the Russian Church by a single person, but it is a mere auxiliary body attached personally to me as the substitute for the Chief Bishop of our Church. The Synod's authority derives from mine and it falls off with same. "The Conference has resolved."

1. "The proposition shall be taken knowledge of and accepted for guidance to a due extent."

2. "A respective application shall be raised in the name of the Acting *Locum Tenens:*

(a) That the Acting *Locum Tenens* and the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod composed of the above named members, the Right Reverend Metropolitan Arseny inclusive, attached to him, be registered;

(b) that the Diocesan Bishops with their auxiliary bodies be registered, and (c) that prior to the registration the Synod be permitted to proceed with their activities.

3. Upon obtaining the registration, the present resolution shall be communicated to the Diocesan Bishops for knowledge and guidance."

Resolved: "That the Diocesan Bishops be given notification of the establishment of the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod attached to the Acting *Locum Tenens* and composed of as above and invested with the above authority, that they be instructed to file their applications supported by the resolution herein to the local governmental authorities for the registration of the Bishops jointly with the Diocesan Council attached to them (the latter shall provisionally be constituted by means of an invitation issued by the Bishops to the persons nominated by them pending the election of the permanent staff on the Diocesan Conventions) as well as for the registration of the Right Reverend Vicar Bishops; that the district governmental authorities be given notice of the composition of the District bodies (attached to the Vicars) and of the Superintendent's Councils which shall not be registered according to the law. Whereof your Eminence are informed to comply with the present."

May 27, 1927. Acting *Locum Tenens* of the Patriarch's Throne (signature) Sergius, Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod. Manager of Files of the Patriarch's Sacred Synod, Sergius, Bishop of Serpukhov (signature).

No. 97. (Patriarch's Seal.)

To His High Eminence, the Most Eminent Eulogius,
Ruler of the Russian Churches in the Western Europe.

The Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Churches in the Western Europe does hereby certify that the original hereof under the signature made by Metropolitan Sergius with his own hand and known to His High Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius is kept in the files of the Diocesan Administration and was really received from Russia in a due mailing order by air mail.

This copy is issued to His High Eminence Metropolitan Platon Rojdestvensky, the Ruling Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in the North America.

President of the Diocesan Council
Archpriest (signature)
Secretary Ametistov (signed).

Seal of the Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Abroad Churches in Europe.[1]

---

[1] Translated by M. J. Petchkovsky, Esq., New York.

Immediately upon its reëstablishment the Sacred Synod applied itself in the task of consolidating the Russian Church throughout the world on a program that was non-political. As is shown in the sequence this does not imply an acceptance or defense of the principles of communism; but the recognition that the Russian Orthodox Church accepts the powers ordained of God. Under the circumstances, membership in the Russian Orthodox Church implies respect for the government under which the Church in Russia functions.

It follows therefore that if the foreign Churches are to remain in communion with the Russian Orthodox Church, it is necessary that they should not be viewed in Russia as focal points of a counter-revolutionary movement.

The Metropolitan has stated his position most clearly in the following letter and accompanying ukase:

The Moscow Patriarchate
Substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens*
July 1/14, 1927
No. 96. Moscow.

Your Eminence: On April 22-May 5, 1922, the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon and the Sacred Synod attached to him issued a resolution whereby the Provisional Supreme Administration of Russian Churches abroad was dismissed chiefly on account of their political activities and Your Eminence were placed in charge of the Churches aforesaid and instructed to submit your considerations with regard to the further establishment of the Church administration abroad. The commission given to you remained unfulfilled in 1922 (perhaps because of the fact the Most Holy was at that time isolated) as well as in 1923 when the Most Holy resumed to head the Administration of the Russian Church. However, the dismissed Supreme Church Administration got regenerated (seemingly not without your concurrence) and has continued its former activities inimical to the Union. The Moscow Patriarchate is not desirous to impose any political program whatsoever. It cannot, however, keep indifferent facing such activities of the clergy under its jurisdiction. This is why the problem of the clergy residing abroad has attracted the attention of the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod formed near me since the first step of its official activities started with the permission of the government. I am sending herewith an ukase with our resolution concerning the clergy residing abroad, and I beg you, on my part,

to let me know by telegraph, in order to speed this cause, if you have or not accepted the requirement (paragraph 1) mentioned in the ukase.

I take an opportunity of forwarding to you simultaneously the ukase on the formation of the Provisional Patriarch's Synod near me and I wish to add that besides the Archpastors mentioned in the ukase the Right Reverend Archbishops Anatoly (Grisiuk) of Samara and Paul (Borisovsky) of Viatka have been invited by me later on.

I beg you for prayers and remain with my perfect respect and devotion,

Your Eminence's Brother in Christ and Servant,
SERGIUS, Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod
for Patriarch's *Locum Tenens.*

To His High Eminence the Most Eminent Eulogius,
Ruler of the Russian Churches in the Western Europe.

The Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Churches in the Western Europe does hereby certify that the original hereof under the signature made by Metropolitan Sergius with his own hand and known to His High Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius is kept in the files of the Diocesan Administration and was really received from Russia in a due mailing order by air mail.

This copy is issued to His High Eminence Metropolitan Platon Rojdestvensky the Ruling Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in the North America.

President of the Diocesan Council
ARCHPRIEST (signature)
SECRETARY AMETISTOV (signed)

SEAL of the Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Abroad Churches in Europe.[2]

To the Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius,
Ruler of the Russian Churches in the Western Europe.

The Substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens* and the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod attached to him have heard:

The proposition by the Substitute as follows:

"At a preliminary conference held by me, together with the Right Reverend members of the Synod, a draft was made of our resolution concerned with our clergy residing abroad on account of their anti-sovietic, public activities. I direct to put the above mentioned resolution in a due form and to enforce it."

---

[2] Translated by M. J. Petchkovsky, Esq., New York.

After the inquiry was made—

It Was Resolved: The Russian Orthodox Church had formerly abroad, on the stavropiguial principles, only Churches attached to the Russian institutions or located within the settlements of the Russian subjects. There were only a few foreign subjects, particularly among the clergy, who could be hardly counted in a general account. Exceptions to this have been only the Missions established by our Church in America, China, and Japan which first promoted to the status of the autonomous dioceses, and later of the churches. Under such circumstances it could not have been imagined, indeed, that the Russian priest residing abroad and being employed by the Russian Church might have openly proceeded against the Russian Government. Whilst our clergy, who has gone abroad together with the emigrants and who is still employed by the Russian Church, being at the same time within no citizenship of the Union, allow themselves to display openly public activities directed against the Soviet Government and to make in this way an incalculable harm to the Church. Wherefore and for the purposes of removing one of the most important obstacles for a calm existence of our Church,

It Was Resolved that:

1. The Ruler of the Russian Churches in the Western Europe, the Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius, and through him all Russian Archpastors residing abroad, as well as other clergy, be directed to give a promise in writing as follows:

"I, the undersigned do hereby give the present promise that being now within the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate, I will not let myself do anything in my public, and particularly in my ecclesiastical activities, that might be taken as an expression of my unloyalty to the Soviet Government."

2. Those who would refuse to comply with the requirement set forth in the paragraph first herein, or who would fail to respond to the present prior to September 15-2, as well as those who would break the promise assumed, shall be removed from their offices and excluded from the records of the clergy which is under the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

3. If the Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius will comply with the requirement set forth in Paragraph 1 herein, he shall be allowed to head as before the administration of the Russian churches in the Western Europe and shall be instructed to receive the promise aforesaid from those who have consented to give same, to distribute such clergymen among the parishes and other respective Church offices and thereafter to submit a detailed report to the Patriarchate, together with the original promises and with his own plans of his future administration of the

Russian churches located abroad and subjected to the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate.

4. In the event that the Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius has refused to comply with the requirement set forth in Paragraph 1 herein, the statements in writing, together with the promises shall be forwarded by the clergy residing abroad to the Substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens* and the latter shall in such event be authorized provisionally and until new instructions to administer the Russian churches located abroad and subjected to the jurisdiction of the Patriarchate.

5. The Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius shall be instructed in writing to notify in the official way the Russian clergy residing abroad of the present resolution and of his own attitude, and also to report immediately to the Substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens* whether or not he consented to the above requirement.

The present resolution shall be communicated to the Right Reverend Metropolitan Eulogius as an "ukase" attached to the letter of the Substitute for the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens* (Patriarch Throne) and shall be published in periodicals for general information.

For Patriarch's *Locum Tenens*

(Signed) SERGIUS, Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod.

July 1/14, 1927.

No. 95.

Manager of Files of the Provisional Patriarch's Sacred Synod

(Signed) SERGIUS, Bishop of Serpukhov.

The Moscow Patriarchate

Substitute of the Patriarch's *Locum Tenens*

Sergius, Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod.

The Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Churches in the Western Europe does hereby certify that the original hereof, under the signature made by Metropolitan Sergius with his own hand and known to His High Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius, is kept in the files of the Diocesan Administration and was really received from Russia in a due mailing order by air mail.

This copy is issued to His High Eminence Metropolitan Platon Rozdestvensky, the Ruling Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America.

President of the Diocesan Council

ARCHPRIEST (Signature)

SECRETARY AMETISTOV (Signed)

SEAL of the Diocesan Administration of the Russian Orthodox Abroad Churches in Europe.[3]

[3] Translated by M. J. Petchkovsky, Esq., New York.

It is important to note that the conditions imposed by the Metropolitan Sergius are negative, demanding that those representing the Patriarchal Synod abstain from acts of disloyalty. There is no implication of submission to Soviet rule or acceptance of Soviet principles. It seemed necessary, especially in face of the activities of the Karlowitz Synod, for the official representatives of the *locum tenens* to eschew political discussions and avoid any display of partisanship.

To the ukase of the Metropolitan Sergius the Metropolitan Eulogius replied:

To His High Eminence, the Most Reverend Sergius,
Metropolitan of Nijny Novgorod,
Substitute for the *Locum Tenens* of the Moscow Patriarch's Throne.

I received the Ukases of the Provisional Patriarch's Synod No. 97 of May 27th, on the establishment of this Synod, and No. 95 of July 1/14 on the clergy residing abroad, as well as the letter of Your High Eminence No. 96 of the same date, attached to the Ukases:

It was highly important for me to listen to the voice of the All-Russian Church Authority and I hope that in the near future the voice of the whole of the Russian Church will sound still stronger and more authoritatively at the All-Russian Local Sobor participated by all Hierarchs-confessors, clergy, and by the whole Russian Church people.

As to the question in the Ukase No. 95 on the Russian clergy residing abroad, I have the honor to submit to Your High Eminence and to the Provisional Patriarch's Synod that from the very beginning of my ecclesiastical and public activities in the Western Europe I have been guided by two fundamental principles: first, the closest undissolvable unity with the Mother Russian Patriarchal Church formerly headed by the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon and now headed by his lawful successors, and, second, the concentration of the ecclesiastic and public activities on the religious and moral education of the flock only with non-interference of the Church into the political life. This was achieved by me through a lengthy and hard struggle and grievous sufferings. I have been always keeping this attitude and I will keep it infallibly in the future.

As to our attitude toward the Soviet Government, we, Russian emigrés, are not within the citizenship of the Union of S. S. R., nor the government itself has been treating us in this manner, as it pronounced so in a special decree. With regard to the Soviet Government, we are just in the same position as the Orthodox citizens of Lithuania, Latvia,

America, China, and Japan belonging also to the same Russian Orthodox Church.

As Your High Eminence have righteously pointed out, the Church authority may impose upon nobody any political program or restrain the freedom of political convictions, and the diversity in the State citizenship may not prevent us from being within the bosom of the only Mother Russian Orthodox Church. On the other hand, the fact that we belong to the Russian Orthodox Church may be of no reason that we, emigrés, be required keeping "loyal," *i.e.,* law obedient, toward the Soviet Government to the same extent as Soviet citizens or residents are.

The clergy residing abroad being free and politically independent is, however, bound to take care of the Russian Church, their parent mother suffering so much, and hence by all means to keep off in its activities from what harm her. The Church being the Christian conscience of life, nothing but a strictly religious, moral, and genuinely Christian enlightenment of its events should constitute the duty of the clergy.

And now, being conscious of my duty toward the Mother Church, in sake of my unreserved love to her, I do bind myself therefore to stand firm on the principle of non-interference of the Church into politics as such principle has been accepted by us according to the will of the Most Holy Patriarch Tikhon, and not to let the Church "amvon" in the churches under my jurisdiction be transformed into a political tribune.

I would be endlessly happy if the above statement will be met with approval by you and the Patriarch's Synod attached to you, because, may I state once more, the canonic unity with the Mother Russian Church is endlessly dear to us. This is for this particular reason that prior to completing this letter I beg asking very warmly not to tear us away from the salvatory bosom of our parent Russian Church with which all our life, both in present and in past, is tied.

If, however, contrary to our expectation, you will not recognize this my statement as satisfactory and will feel compelled to exclude me and the clergy entrusted to me from the records of the clergy of the Russian Church, we shall have nothing to do but to submit this new most grievous ordeal. Will you in such a case give us your blessing, according to your suggestion once previously expressed by you, for a provisionally independent (autonomous) existence in non-Orthodox countries and for our submission to the jurisdiction of local Orthodox Churches in Orthodox countries?

In connection with what is set out above and in pursuance of Par. 3 of the Ukase of the Synod No. 93, I beg to report to Your High Eminence that after receiving your answer to the present, I contemplate to convoke the Church Convention of the Church residing abroad for the

determination of the further establishment of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of the borders of Russia.

Asking for your holy prayers, with my deep consideration and brotherly love in Christ, I have the honor to be Your High Eminence's

Most humble servant,

(Original is signed): METROPOLITAN EULOGIUS.[4]

Paris, August 30 (Sept. 12), 1927.

It has been impossible to obtain a copy of the reply of the Metropolitan Sergius. The following statement, however, was published in *Poslednya Novosti,* October 19, 1927.

"An answer has been received in the form of a letter from the Metropolitan Sergius to the very well known letter of Metropolitan Eulogius. Metropolitan Sergius has pointed out that the terms of 'loyalty' may not mean, indeed, the obedience to the Soviet laws, and that the request that the clergy should keep off from political activities refers not only to the 'Church amvon' but to all ecclesiastic and public pastoral activities.

"Metropolitan Sergius has repeated his request that the promises of non-interference of the Church into the policy be obtained not only from Metropolitan Eulogius himself, but also from each and every member of the clergy residing abroad. At the same time he does not insist upon any specified form to make such a promise, but he affords a complete freedom in this respect to the clergy residing abroad; the time to produce such statements is extended by Metropolitan Sergius up to November 15th."

Having addressed himself to the Church abroad the Metropolitan applies his energies and resourcefulness to the solution of the problems at home. His program was summarized in his letter of July 16th, which has already been quoted, in Part IV, Chapter 2.

With those efforts the Metropolitan has placed before the Church both at home and abroad a program of unity and constructive effort which is again making religion a power in Russia.

It has been necessary to write this chapter because the problem of the Karlowitz Synod has become a matter of local

[4] (Published in and quoted from the *Vozrojdenie,* Russian daily in Paris of September 16, 1927, No. 836.) Translated by M. J. Petchkovsky, Esq., New York.

concern in America. At the same time the Synod must be watched because of the international implications. As long as a monarchial group exists in Europe, false impressions regarding the *émigrés* will be current both at home and in Russia. Anyone who is conversant with the sentiment of the *émigrés* in Europe and America knows that the following of Grand Duke Cyril as claimant to the throne of Russia is very small indeed. It would be very difficult to find one in a thousand who is thinking in terms of the return of Romanoff Dynasty. The little group at Karlowitz speak for a very small party. Whenever prominent names are mentioned among those of the adherents or associates of these ultramontanes it is not difficult to detect the motives which have prompted their allegiance. Should there be a sudden debacle of the Soviet Government tomorrow, it would be almost impossible to muster more than a respectable bodyguard for any claimant to the Russian throne.

Apart from the false hopes which give life and being to this very small monarchical party, there is a peril in this movement for the Church in Russia. Espionage in the Balkans plays a great part in the Soviet program. While in Athens last spring, the author was told that while the staff of the American Legation numbered less than a dozen, that of the Soviet Legation numbered over sixty. Through such sources the Soviet government is kept well informed. It is also to be feared that in some quarters chauvinistic methods are used to encourage the Sobor in its monarchical propaganda that the evil report of counter-revolutionary movement among the *émigrés* and especially within the Church, may be reported to Russia.

Happily now we are assured that new efforts are being made to bring the Diocesan Council in Western Europe and the Karlowitz Synod together on a platform entirely freed from politics.

PART V

Soviet Religion Abroad

CHAPTER I. Religious Propaganda Abroad

CHAPTER II. Defying the Christian World

CHAPTER III. Trial of Archbishop Cieplak and Mgr. Budkievicz

CHAPTER I

Religious Propaganda Abroad

TO the average reader the development of the religious policy of the Soviet has presented an interesting, although very distressing, study for the student of current events. While the trial of Mgr. Cieplak, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Russia, was viewed even by the British Secretary of Foreign Affairs as testing the sentiment of the civilized world towards the trial of the Patriarch Tikhon, it was interpreted by closer students of Russian affairs as a preparation for the extension of the campaign of Godlessness outside of Russia. That this was a part of the general plan of the Bolsheviks may be seen in their own publications, thus:

"The methods, the form, and the tactics of the anti-religious campaign are determined by the general situation. The latter is changing in such direction that soon even the blind will see that we must fight the priest, whether he be called pastor, rabbi, patriarch, mullah, or pope. At some future stage that struggle will inevitably become a struggle 'against God' whether he be called Jehovah, Jesus, Buddha, or Allah." [1]

In Germany alone the danger was evident, possibly because the provocation was greater. Repeated attacks by young communists against worshippers in the Berlin Cathedral were met by this official warning in the Berlin papers:

"In order to prevent the disturbance during the service in the Berlin Cathedral, the president of the police has issued an order forbidding all demonstrations in Lustgarten before the end of the Cathedral service." [2]

---

[1] *Methods of Anti-religious Propaganda,* by I. Stephanov.

[2] *Rul,* 1923.

We have already spoken of the Comsomol, a union of young communists to develop a cult of Godlessness. At a conference in 1923 the following report was made:

"In the East we are continuing to draw over to communism large masses of youth. In Korea there are at present seventy organizations with 50,000 members; in China the Union of Communistic Youth counts 3,000 members, to whom must be added the 50,000 strong army of Chinese students who are the most revolutionary element among the Chinese people. In Mongolia the Union may count upon 1,500 members; in Japan the movement is also progressing, and so on. In Germany 35,000 people belong to the Union, which hopes to enlarge its membership to 100,000. In Norway we have 18,000 adherents; in Russia itself more than 300,000 are united in our organization, whereas the total number in the world is about 750,000." [8]

This was but a preparation for a larger propaganda extending into the Western World. I. Stephanov, in his semi-official statements on "methods of anti-religious propaganda," states:

"Perhaps in Europe the time has not yet arrived for such forms of anti-religious propaganda as are possible with us, but it is not far away. We must prepare for it."

And further:

"The struggle will develop in the Mohammedan and Roman Catholic countries in the same way, only its stages will succeed quicker to each other."

This international chauvinism is a cardinal principle of the Soviet program. On the tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, Mr. Stalin announced to the world:

"The October revolution was not a national but an international revolution—a radical change in the history of humanity from the old capitalist world to a new socialist world. The former 'great' revolutions in England, France, and Germany were nothing but the substitution of one group of exploiters for another—with the exception of the

[8] Report of the Conference of Communistic Youth, June, 1923.

heroic though unsuccessful attempt of the Paris commune. The October revolution differs from the others in principle."[4]

"And meanwhile it is the center and the base of the revolutionary movement, prepared to take advantage of the revolutionary situation which will inevitably be produced by capitalist rivalries, in other words, we children of the October revolution become an important factor in world affairs, with a definite specific gravity.

"The era of capitalism's ruin has begun."

Senator King has enumerated at length instances of intrigue on the part of diplomatic and consular agents of the Soviet Government in foreign lands.[5] Because of the pernicious activities Great Britain served her diplomatic relations with the Soviets and the British Labor Unions repudiated all connections with Russian Communism. The secret departure of Mr. Rakovsky from Paris to avoid official expulsion is still fresh in our memories.

Some of the methods to which recourse was had are amusing but very annoying. Thus Stephanov urges:

"In order to strike at the Polish clergy, we must make use of the history of the Popes. The material is exceedingly rich. The wider, the more universal was the influence of the Roman Church, the more vulnerable it was from our point of view. Now it is high time that we took to that task."[6]

While the Mohammedans are treated gently as a rule, an atheistic propaganda in Moslem countries is in continual process. In 1923 *Izvestia* quotes a telegram from Baku "demanding a trial of Mahomet."[7]

In April, 1923, *Izvestia,* the official daily journal of the Soviets, reports that the reformed Church intends to organize its branches abroad.[8] A special chapter treats of its activities in America.

---

[4] Quoted by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S.J., at a luncheon of the Foreign Policy Association, Nov. 19, 1927, Pamphlet No. 47, Series 1927-8, December, 1927.

[5] See *Congressional Record,* May 24, 1924.

[6] Stephanov, *ibid.*

[7] *Izviestia,* No. 83 (1820), 17, IV, 1923.

[8] *Izviestia,* No. 40 (1781), 27, II, 1923.

The effort to drag the American Methodist Church into the melee through the sympathy of Bishop Blake was less successful. The following resolution of the Czecho-Slovak Branch of the Methodist Church South is an example of the general attitude towards Bishop Blake's activities:

"The information that appeared in newspapers, based upon the alleged declaration of Bishop Blake, gives a false picture of the relations between the Methodist Church and the Soviet, or any other, Government.

"Bishop Blake went to Moscow, not as a representative of the Methodist Church, but on his own initiative.

"Basing itself upon the declarations ascribed to Bishop Blake, the Council of the Methodist Church, which sits at present in the City of Kansas City in the U. S. A., has ordered Bishop Blake to leave Russia.

"The Methodist Church is not, and will never be, a political organization.

"The great task of Methodism is the spreading throughout the world of the pure doctrine of the Gospels of our Lord and of His love and the endeavor to bring all the men without any radical, political, or religious distinctions to the fuller understanding of the principles of Christianity.

"Any information with regard to the above-stated may be obtained in the Methodist Mission in Prague.[9]

"(Signed) J. L. Neill,
Head of the Mission."

The Archbishop of Canterbury receives flattering attention. Radek, a noted Communist, published "A History Lecture for the Archbishop of Canterbury together with a lecture on the History of the Archbishop of Canterbury." Its style may be judged by this statement in the second chapter: "How the Archbishop of Canterbury defended 'freedom of religion' from the mutinied peasants and workers":

"According to the history of the Archbishops of Canterbury, it comes out that when the king appoints himself head of the Church, when he establishes its doctrine and even plunders it just a little, all this means 'freedom of religion,' provided the archbishops have their share of the booty.

[9] *Studenceskiji Godi* (Prague), No. 2, 1923.

". . . when the believers, the peasants and the workers, basing themselves on the Holy Scripture, demand that the priestcraft should give up the life of luxury and gluttony and live with the people, this means a sacrilege for which the Archbishops of Canterbury sent to death thousands of laboring people.

"It is now clear that Thomas Devizen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, in the year 1923 after the so-called birth of Christ, is doing that which his predecessors did in the fourteenth and sixteenth centuries. The monk John Boll who in the clumsy language of the fourteenth century proclaimed the truth of communism was just as hateful to the Archbishop of Canterbury of the fourteenth century as the agents of Moscow are to the Archbishop of Canterbury of the twentieth century.

"How can then Thomas Devizen, the Archbishop of Canterbury, help advocating Tikhon, the champion of kings, landowners, and capitalists? But the Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Devizen is actuated not only by his hate of Lollard movement which has been revised in the twentieth century in faraway Russia, he is also prompted by sympathy with the Russian landowners and capitalists. . . ."

The cause of all these rash statements was this news dispatch dated London, April 12, 1923:

"The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Westminster, and the Chief Rabbi, united in the feelings of indignation and disgust, have issued a joint protest against the cruel war declared by the Russian Soviet Government upon all religious creeds, and against the wild persecutions of the clergy and laymen. They declare that such policy must arouse a protest of all the friends of religious tolerance."

The Pope also received his share of attention. *Pravda* published an article, "Why no proceedings have been instituted against the Pope":

"One extremely curious detail was revealed in this trial which was not given proper attention to, either in the proceedings or in the verdict. All the accused justified their behavior with regard to confiscation by the fact that they merely obeyed the will of their Chief—the Pope—who is therefore the real criminal, they being but his accomplices and agents. That being so . . . why did we not institute proceedings against the chief organizer and inspirer, against the chief criminal—the Pope? Why did we not bring the revolutionary justice to bear upon him? . . . Perhaps because he did not personally offer any direct resistance? But then

no more did Tikhon, and yet he will be brought to law as the chief leader and wire-puller. Then, perhaps, the Pope was not handed over to justice out of fear of some international complications that might arise in that case? Apparently not, for as it is known, no international complications ever arise when a priest is tried, be he the Pope himself; they are usually the outcome of more real and material economic causes.

"Or, perhaps, it was thought that as the Pope is outside Soviet Russia it would be impossible to carry the verdict out? . . . Yet we are firmly convinced, nay, more, we know—that it will be carried out, for sooner or later bourgeois Italy will become a Soviet country and then his Holiness the Pope will be in exactly as awkward a position as his colleague, Patriarch Tikhon. . . . But let us even admit the impossible; let us admit that revolution in Italy will be retarded. Or better, let us imagine that the Pope dies an untimely death. Even then trial against him would be of great significance. After all, the Pope is regarded by the devout Catholics to be an infallible saint almost supernatural being. Imagine this saint being tried and sentenced as an ordinary layman!"[10]

[10] *Pravda,* No. 73, 3, IV, 1923.

CHAPTER II

Defying the Christian World

THE actual conflict between the religious powers of the West and the Soviet Government grew out of the indignities suffered by leaders in the Roman Communion and the arrest and impending trial of the Patriarch. As we have already indicated, the trial of Mgr. Cieplak was a ruse to feel out the sentiment of Europe towards the trial of the Patriarch. The crowning affront was the condemnation of Mgr. Budkiewicz. The whole Christian world was moved to consternation and protest. Several governments made vigorous protests. The head of the Polish government, speaking in behalf of the Christian world, closes his protest:

"I warn the Soviet Government not only in my capacity of the head of the Polish Government, but in behalf of the whole civilized world, which is unanimous in condemning this unprecedented act of violence, and that the responsibility for carrying out the sentence, whose injustice is so utterly obvious, rests entirely with the aforesaid government."[1]

To this Kalinin, waiting until the international irritation was some allayed, defiantly replied:

"The All-Russian Executive Committee, having examined the petitions of citizens Cieplak and Budkiewicz upon whom the sentence of capital punishment was passed by the Supreme Court, decreed as follows:

"The activities of citizen Cieplak, as established by the Court, were obviously and avowedly meant for the detriment of the working class; they were directed against the fundamental conquests of the proletarian revolution, and tried to abuse the freedom of religious worship which

---

[1] Quoted in *For Freedom,* No. 71 (812), 27, III, 1923.

was guaranteed by the law to all denominations alike; they represent therefore a very grave crime for which the revolutionary republic, still surrounded by its enemies, has no other punishment but that applied by the court with regard to citizen Cieplak.

"Taking, however, into account the fact that citizen Cieplak belongs to that religious denomination which in the times of Tsarism and under the bourgeois republic was persecuted by the government, and that the carrying out of the punishment which he really deserves might be interpreted by the most backward elements of the Roman Catholic population of Soviet Russia, whose religious prejudices were made use of by Cieplak and his accomplices, as directed primarily against their creed, the Central Executive Committee resolves to substitute the sentence passed by the Court by 10 years imprisonment in strict isolation.

"As regards the other condemned, viz.: citizen Budkiewicz, who coupled his religious activities with direct counter-revolutionary work under the auspices of a hostile bourgeois government and used his position of a priest for crimes which are tantamount to high treason, his petition for reprieve is to be rejected.

"Signed: Chairman M. KALININ,
"Secretary T. SAPRONOV."[2]

Immediately upon receipt of this document, the British government requested its representative in Moscow to demand a delay in executing the sentence. The governments of Czechoslovakia and Italy, together with the Vatican, sent similar demands.

The reply was prompt. The *Izviestia* (April 6, 1923) published the following official communication:

"The sentence of the Supreme Court with regard to citizen Budkiewicz whose petition for reprieve was rejected by the All-Russian Executive Committee has been carried out."[3]

At the same time, the European Press published the following details of Mgr. Budkiewicz's death. He was shot from behind in the cellar of the Moscow Extraordinary Commission on March 31st, *i.e.*, on the eve of the Roman Catholic Easter. Here are two reports:

"1. News has just reached here that the execution of Mgr. Bud-

[2] *Izviestia*, No. 70 (1807), March 30, 1923.
[3] *Izviestia*, No. 73 (1810), 6, IV, 1923.

kiewicz was carried out at four o'clock last Saturday morning. In accordance with the Soviet practice, the condemned priest was taken to a cellar beneath the building of the Cheka. Here he was made to stand with the executioner behind him, and was then shot with a revolver through the back of his head. His body was afterwards removed to some unknown spot.

"The first news of the execution was not received here until yesterday morning, telegraphic communication with the West having been suspended on Friday evening by order of the Soviet authorities."

The Bolshevist newspapers in publishing the official communique regarding the execution, made sarcastic comments on the intervention of foreign countries to save the life of the Prelate. The *Pravda* covered the Holy See with insults and exhorted Italian Communists to condemn the Pope to death by default pending his appearance before an international revolutionary tribunal.

"2. The body of Mgr. Budkiewicz, together with the bodies of ten bandits who were shot the same day, was taken to the anatomic theater of the Iauzsky Hospital. Only one revolver bullet was found in the brain. He was shot from almost no distance."

Towards the end of May the persecutions reached such a point that they attracted the attention of the European public opinion.

The lead was given by the Archbishop of Canterbury, who came forward with the following declaration:

"The Archbishop of Canterbury asked whether the Government could give any information respecting the alleged arrest of the Patriarch of the Russian Church and the threatened execution of bishops and priests. A week ago he received a letter, dated Berlin, May 11th, from the Metropolitan Eulogius, who looked after the congregations of Russians in Europe outside of Russia, in which he said:

" 'Today's paper brought us the sad news of All-Russia's Patriarch Tikhon's arrest by the Moscow Soviet authorities, who will not fail undoubtedly to inflict on him the severest penalty. The only accusation brought against him is his obedience to a sense of duty in refusing to submit to the theft of Church property, of sacred vessels and relics, and all needed for holy services. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ we appeal to you and to all the Episcopalian members of the Church of

England to lift your voice in protest of this act of unheard of violence and illegality, directed against the highest representative of the Russian clergy. We implore you to use your influence to alleviate as much as possible Patriarch Tikhon's undeserved chastisement.'

"He felt himself bound to make public the need, as it seemed to him, of the Russian Church for at least the sympathy of the Christians of Europe generally, and so that they might have knowledge of what was now taking place. The statement was being made, with brazen effrontery, that the Russian Church was now being punished because it had declined to help to relieve the famine-stricken people. The fact was that on three, if not four, separate occasions the Church had, in the fullest possible way, given an undertaking to raise larger sums than were likely to be raised in any other manner and to see that money was properly administered. Those offers had been absolutely refused by the Soviet authorities. The treasures of the Church had, in spite of the Patriarch's protests, been seized with, if the reports were to be believed, horrible roughness and violence, and the Patriarch himself had been arrested, even if he was not in danger of death. They, as Christians, could not look on unmoved at such a state of things as that. (Hear, hear.)

"Lord Emmott, associating himself with what the Archbishop of Canterbury had said, appealed to the government to give the most emphatic warning to the Soviet Government that any extreme measure against either the Patriarch or the priests of the Russian Church would have the most deplorable results in regard to famine relief work in this country and also in regard to the wider question of general Russian reconstruction.

"Lord Weardale spoke of the difficulties which the organization with which he was connected had encountered in carrying out their relief work in Russia, and said that, in spite of all, their stores were arriving with much greater rapidity than had formerly been the case, and their work was proceeding satisfactorily. (Hear, hear.)

"The Earl of Crawford, in reply, said the Soviet Government recently ordered a confiscation of church valuables, and this led to the riots in various parts of Russia. So far as the government were aware, these riots were spontaneous outbreaks, and there was no evidence to show that they formed part of a conspiracy for which either the Patriarch or Church were responsible. A number of priests had been sentenced to death, but the sentences had not been carried out yet. The Patriarch in his defense maintained that as head of the Church he should have some control over the matter. It was not correct that the Patriarch had resigned his office.

"The Marquess of Salisbury: Is the government going to take any

steps to make representations to the Russian Government in the matter?

"The Earl of Crawford: If the Foreign Office had thought that representations would have been profitable, I should have made the announcement." [4]

The Archbishop of Canterbury proposed that a small body of representatives of the various English Churches should visit Russia. This proposal arose out of the protest concerning the treatment of the Patriarch Tikhon.

In reply M. Krassin forwarded to the Archbishop the following communication from his government:

"The protest addressed to the Soviet Government by a number of Churchmen of Great Britain in connection with the proceedings instituted against Patriarch Tikhon calls for the following elucidations:

1. "In spite of the statement contained in the protest, there have been no attacks on the Church. Only proceedings have been instituted against individual representatives of the Church, including its former Patriarch, in connection with the resistance organized by them against measures of the Soviet authorities, which measures were taken in order to save the lives of tens of millions of human beings, including children.

2. "In the conflict between Patriarch Tikhon and the Soviet Power, the vast majority of the clergy sides with the Soviet Power and the laboring masses it represents. Only an insignificant number of the clergy —those who were the most privileged and demoralized through their connection with the Tsarist nobility and with the Capital—form the group of the Patriarch Tikhon. Public opinion in Russia takes note that the protesting English Churchmen express their solidarity not with the starving laboring masses of Russia, nor even with the majority of the clergy, but with an insignificant number of Churchmen who have always been working hand in hand with the Tsars, with the Bureaucracy, and with the nobility, and who have now entered into an open opposition to the power of the workers and peasants.

3. "Public opinion in Russia also notes that at its most inhuman period of the blockade, in which blockade the British Government took part, the authors of the protest did not raise their voices against the strangling of Russian workers, peasants, and children. The people of Russia has not heard that the signatories of the appeal protested against the attempts to strangle with the noose of usury the laboring masses of Russia.

---

[4] *The Times,* June 6, 1922.

4. "The Soviet Power, as well as the laboring masses, consider the above protest of the hierarchy of the various Churches of Great Britain to be dictated by a narrow caste solidarity because it is entirely directed against the real interests of the people, and against the elementary demands of humanity."

To this communication the Archbishop, through his chaplain,[5] sent the following reply:

"In reply to your communication of June 6th on behalf of the Russian Soviet Government, the Archbishop of Canterbury cannot withdraw any of the statements already made by him in the House of Lords on May 25th, statements which were based upon first-hand information from Russia. The first-hand information in the Archbishop's possession particularly emphasizes the fact that the Patriarch of the Russian Church has repeatedly offered the help of the Church for the relief of the famine and that these offers have been consistently refused by the Soviet Government.

"But in view of the explicit *dementi* issued by the Soviet Government the Archbishop feels it incumbent upon him to request that permission be given to a small body of representatives of the various Churches in this country to go to Russia to examine situation on the spot, in order to avoid, in future, misunderstandings."[6]

M. Karakhan, Assistant Commissary for Foreign Affairs, writing in July to the Archbishop's chaplain, said:

"In reply to your communication of June 7th, on behalf of the Archbishop of Canterbury, I beg to inform you that my government does not see any grounds for insisting upon the withdrawal of the statements made by the Archbishop of Canterbury in the House of Lords on May 25th since these statements clearly emanate from sources which in the eyes of the laboring masses of Russia and the whole world, do not merit any confidence. They merely serve to illustrate the class solidarity of the 'princes' of the various Churches, which solidarity is known to be directed against the laboring masses.

"The suggestion made by the Archbishop of Canterbury to send to Russia a body of 'representatives of the various Churches' in order to investigate the situation on the spot, constitutes a claim even less justifiable than would be a suggestion made by the Soviet Government to send to England a small commission to investigate to what extent the laboring masses are exploited materially and spiritually by the hierarchy

[5] The present Dean Bell of Canterbury.
[6] *The Times,* London, June 8, 1922.

of the various English Churches in order to maintain the domination of the exploiting classes."[7]

This letter was forwarded on Saturday by M. Klishko, of the Russian Trade Delegation in London. In acknowledging its receipt the Primate's chaplain said he was directed to send the enclosed memorandum:

"The Archbishop of Canterbury has considered carefully the communication transmitted to him in reply to his request, made on June 7th, that a small body of representatives of the various Churches responsible for the remonstrance of May 31st might be permitted by the Soviet Government to visit Russia. The purpose of such delegation would be to ascertain the particulars of the reported action by the Soviet Government which gave rise to the remonstrance.

"The reply now received refusing that request does not, as the Archbishop notes, challenge the statement made as to the arrest and persecution of leading clergy of the Russian Church, nor does it elucidate the obvious contradiction between the detailed account of these arrests and persecutions given at the first hand to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the account given on behalf of the Soviet Government.

"The allegation that the representatives of the Church of England and of the other Christian denominations who signed the protest were actuated by political or class consideration is devoid of foundation. They were actuated simply by elementary considerations of humanity and of Christian feeling.

"The Archbishop deplores the refusal of the Soviet Government to allow this information to be obtained. Very many people in Great Britain are anxious to promote the friendliest relations between the Russian people at large and the peoples of the English speaking countries, and the letters which the Archbishop receives from America show a similar desire. The present action of the Soviet Government is calculated to retard or prevent the realization of such a hope. If the announcement published during the last few days respecting the death sentence passed upon religious leaders in Russia proves to be well founded, the effect will be one of indignation and horror among civilized people of all classes."[8]

This memorandum was dated July 10, 1922.

However, the reaction of the European public opinion did not influence in the least the state of things in Russia.

---

[7] *Izviestia,* June 19, 1922.

[8] *The Times,* London, July 11, 1922.

The lists of trials and sacrileges registered in the official press continued to grow. Of those we will give below but a few examples:

"Petrograd.—The trial of Churchmen is over. Eleven persons, including Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd, Bishop Benedict of Kronstadt, Archbishop Sergius, Professor Ognev, Professor Novitsky, rector of the Kazan Cathedral, Chucov, rector of the Troitsky (Trinity) Cathedral, Cheltzov, and rector of St. Isaac Cathedral Bogoiavlensky, have been sentenced to death. Twenty-two have been acquitted and 59 sentenced to imprisonment. The Tribunal has decided to bring an action against Patriarch Tikhon." [9]

"Irkutsk, 15, VII.—Achbishop Anatoly of Irkutsk and Upper Lena and the former churchwarden Stefanovsky have been sentenced to death on the charge of concealing Church valuables and taking part in counter-revolutionary activities." [10]

"Tula.—Bishop Iuvenalius, Father Uspensky, and others have been brought to trial. They are accused of officiating before the ikon which was found on the belfry of the Kazan Church. Bishop Iuvenalius has been sentenced to 16 years and the others to 5 years of imprisonment, in strict isolation." [11]

"Gomel.—The revolutionary tribunal of Gomel has just concluded the hearing of the case of 11 Jewish clericals with Rabbi Baryshansky at their head. The latter has been sentenced to three years' imprisonment, the others to shorter periods, four of them only conditionally." [12]

The worthy attitude taken by the accused and by the witnesses is also an object of mockery in the official press. When Patriarch Tikhon was summoned as a witness in the case of 54 priests, *Pravda* wrote scornfully:

"The Patriarch has been summoned to make a legal deposition. He has been called to the red table where three atheists are sitting in judgment. Still worse: he, the Patriarch of all Russia, is being brought to trial, as a simple citizen Bielavin, on the charge of spreading counter-revolutionary proclamations. Isn't it something unheard of?

"The Polytechnic Museum, where the Patriarch gave his deposition in the case of 54 priests, was overcrowded. . . . The Patriarch behaved haughtily throughout the proceedings, smiling at the näive impertinence of the young judges. His whole attitude was marked with self-respect.

---

[9] *Pravda,* No. 148, June 6, 1922.

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] *Ibid.,* No. 158, 159.

[12] *Pravda,* No. 162, July 22, 1922.

But we will join the Moscow tribunal in its coarse blasphemy and add one more question to the legal questions already put:

"Where does that self-respect come from?" [13]

The Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and the Presidents of the Unions and Conferences of the principal Nonconformist bodies in England and Wales, addressed the following telegram to Lenin:

"In the name of the Christian Communions which we represent we desire to protest most earnestly against the attack on the Russian Church in the person of its Patriarch Tikhon.

"The public mind and the conscience of Christendom, and indeed of the whole civilized world, cannot tolerate silently so great a wrong." [14]

The following protest against the ruthless warfare upon all forms of religious belief carried on by the Soviet Government was issued by the heads of the religious denominations in England and in Scotland.[15]

The signatures included the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, Cardinal Bourne, the Moderators of the Church of Scotland, representatives of the Nonconformist bodies, and the Chief Rabbi:

"To all men and women of goodwill.

"The last few weeks have witnessed a portent which has filled all generous-hearted men and women with horror. The ruthless warfare which the Soviet Government of Russia has long carried on against all forms of religious belief has come to a head. During the period of the Soviet rule, hundreds of thousands of religious people, and Ministers of Religion of all ranks and creeds, have been subjected to a savage persecution, the express object of which has been to root religion out of the land. The central facts for which religion stands have been systematically outraged and insulted. The most sacred of religious festivals have been made the occasion for blasphemous travesty, and at this moment the attack upon religion itself finds fresh illustration in the trial for their lives of the chief leaders of religion in Russia.

---

[13] *Pravda,* No. 101, May 9, 1922. [14] *The Times,* London, June 1, 1922.

[15] In connection with this the author was able to convey to the Patriarch, through the courtesy of one of the embassies in Washington, assurances of the sympathy and prayers of American Churchmen.

"The Bolsheviks themselves have not disguised the purpose which they have in view. In their own journal only three weeks ago they confessed both their aim and their difficulty. To quote their words: 'We must carry on our agitation against religion just as systematically as we do in political questions, but with even more determination. . . . Although we have declared war on the denizens of Heaven it is by no means easy to sweep them from the households of the workmen.'[16]

"It is for the sake of those workmen and of the whole people of Russia, and for the preservation in their hearts of faith in God and the maintenance of religious liberty, that we appeal. We represent many religious communions and many political opinions, but we are united in the indignation and horror with which we regard the present policy of systematic persecution of religion in all its forms. Such a policy cannot be tolerated in silence by those who value religion or liberty. Our protest will, we are confident, evoke a response everywhere on the part of those who have at heart the well-being of the world.

"Randall Cantuar

"Cosmo Ebor

"John Smith, Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland

"Francis, Cardinal Bourne

"J. D. Jones (Congregationalist), Moderator of the Federal Council of Evangelical Free Churches of England

"J. H. Shakespeare (Baptist), ex-Moderator of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

"W. Lewis Robertson (Presbyterian)

"W. H. Armstrong (Wesleyan), Secretaries of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches of England

"F. C. Spurr (Baptist), President of the National Free Church Council

"Thomas Nightingale (United Methodist), Secretary of the National Free Church Council

"J. Scott Lidgett (Wesleyan), Hon. Secretary of the National Free Church Council

"John Clifford, ex-President of the Baptist World Alliance

"A. E. Garvie, ex-Chairman of the Congregational Union

"R. F. Horton, Minister of Lyndhurst road, Hampstead, Congregational Church.

"J. H. Jowett, formerly Minister, Westminster Chapel

"W. Bramwell Booth, General of the Salvation Army

"I. H. Hertz, Chief Rabbi."[17]

---

[16] *Times*, London, March 29, 1922. [17] *The Times*, April 6, 1923.

CHAPTER III

Trial of Archbishop Cieplak and Mgr. Budkievicz

REFERENCE has already been made to the condemnation of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Petrograd, Mgr. Cieplak, head of that Communion in Russia, and the execution of Mgr. Budkievicz. A fuller survey seems desirable to illustrate the rashness of the Soviet Government and their utter disregard of the sentiments of the civilized world.[1]

It is interesting to note that the misdemeanors which served as a pretext for the trial of these prelates date back to April, 1920, and that the charges were not pressed until the spring of 1923. This was about the time that the trial of the Patriarch Tikhon was under consideration. There seems to be little reason for doubt that the government was conscious of the antagonism both at home and abroad which would grow out of this trial. Likewise there was an evident desire to learn how far they could proceed in the execution of a verdict following the condemnation of the Patriarch.

The Roman Catholic Church had become strongly entrenched in the Polish speaking section of Russia; and since the October Revolution had become closely organized for the defense of the rights granted by the decree separating Church and State. As a Church under foreign control it could not accept all the limiting conditions growing out of that decree.

---

[1] A very full account of this trial is given from a Roman Catholic point of view in *The Bolshevik Persecution of Christianity,* by Capt. F. McCullough, Dutton & Co., 1924. Captain McCullogh was present at all sittings of the Court. The book is marred by his harsh criticism of the Orthodox clergy.

The initial clash with the Soviet authorities was in 1920, but this was ignored until the spring of 1923. At that time a Soviet journal states:

> "In April, 1920, the agents of the Extraordinary Commission have searched the flat of citizen Budkievicz and found the minutes of the sittings of the Roman Catholic Clergy which took place in Petrograd in the period of time between December 18, 1918, and April 7, 1920.
>
> "At those sittings were present Archbishop Ropp of Mogilev, Bishop Jan Cieplak, Mgrs. Manetzky and Budkievicz, Fathers Vassilevsky, Modovilkis, Junevitch, Majuiakis, and others."[2]

In response to an interpolation in the House of Lords, Marquess Curzon stated that the persecution of the Roman Catholics in Russia dated back to December 2, 1922, when a Roman Catholic church in Petrograd was closed by the Bolshevists. A few days later ten other Roman Catholic churches were closed in Petrograd. The reason given by the Bolshevists was the refusal of the Roman Catholic clergy to recognize a decree for the lease and use of Church property. The effect of this decree was to recognize the ownership by the State of Church property, in contravention to the laws of the Roman Catholic Church. An appeal was made to the Pope by Mgr. Cieplak, through the Papal Nuncio at Warsaw, on December 6th.

Nothing further was heard of any persecution until a telegram was received on January 27, 1923, from His Majesty's representative at the Vatican, stating that Mgr. Cieplak and other priests had been arrested for opposing the confiscation of the sacred vessels by the Soviet. On receipt of this news a telegram was sent to the British agent at Moscow, instructing him to make strong representations on behalf of Mgr. Cieplak and the other priests, unless he considered this would do more harm than good. Mr. Hodgson, the British agent, made representations to M. Litvinoff, pointing out the lamentable impression on public opinion abroad if the trial was persisted in.

---

[2] *Pravda,* No. 55, March 11, 1923.

On March 19th Mr. Hodgson was again instructed to save the lives of those arrested. The government's own information from Mr. Hodgson showed that the ecclesiastics in question were not arrested until March 10th, although previously threatened with arrest. On March 5th Mgr. Cieplak and fifteen other priests had been summoned before the revolutionary tribunal in Moscow, and were then transported through the streets in a military truck under an armed guard. The trial was due to begin on March 14th. There was ground for thinking that the real object was to provide material for an anti-Christian demonstration before Easter, and prepare for the trial of the Patriarch Tikhon. The government had heard that morning that the trial had now been postponed, probably to March 21st.[3]

The charges are briefly stated in the *Pravda*:

"On March 14th there will be heard in the Supreme Court of Justice the case of the Roman Catholic Churchmen who are accused of opposition to the decrees of the Soviet Government concerning the confiscation of the Church treasures and the Disestablishment of the Church."[4]

Reports of the trial reached the outside world through the London *Times* at Riga:

"Riga, March 22d—The trial of the Roman Catholic Church dignitaries of Petrograd, including Archbishop Cieplak, began at Moscow yesterday.

"Galkin is acting as president of the tribunal, and Krylenko, who prosecuted the Social Revolutionaries last summer, is prosecuting counsel. Defending counsel is Bobristcheff-Pushkin.

"Mgr. Cieplak, Catholic Metropolitan of Petrograd, and a number of priests, are accused of forming an anti-revolutionary organization in 1918, of actively opposing the Soviet policy with respect to religion, and of concealing treasures from the requisition authorities."

"Riga, March 23d—The Church dignitaries now appearing before the Supreme Revolutionary Tribunal include Archbishop Cieplak, Bishops Malevsky and Budkievicz, eleven Catholic priests, and the Uniat priest Feodoroff.

---

[3] *Times*, London, March 21, 1923.

[4] *Pravda*, Moscow, No. 55, March 11, 1923.

"The indictment states that in 1918 the Catholic clergy formed an organization in Petrograd to thwart the Soviet's decrees separating Church and State. In 1920, on Mgr. Cieplak's initiative, it was decided to offer active resistance. In particular the clergy refused to sign the agreement to give up churches and church property. In 1922 they refused to surrender sequestrated valuables.

"When questioned, the priests stated they owed obedience only to spiritual authority."

"Riga, March 26th—The trial of the Catholic clergy in Moscow is drawing to an end, and the sentences are expected today or tomorrow.

"Krylenko demands death for Archbishop Cieplak, Bishop Budkievicz, and the priests Kveshko and Eismont, and imprisonment for the remainder. Krylenko bases his demand on the Soviet criminal code, Articles 69 and 199, but the defending counsel plead the impossibility of sentence under this code, which, having been introduced only last autumn, was not in existence when the alleged offences were committed. Nevertheless the pronouncement, perhaps the actual execution of the death sentence, is generally considered possible under the Soviet's elastic system of justice." [5]

The nature of the evidence upon which conviction was based may be evaluated by the following quotations from American and Russian journals. The Chicago *Tribune,* March 24, 1923, states:

"Bishop Cieplak and other accused behave with great dignity and do not hide their contempt of the Soviet Government. Their outspoken replies to the questions of the Chairman of the Tribunal disconcert even the counsels for defence.

"Questioned whether they recognized the Soviet Government the accused replied: 'We recognize Rome, not Moscow.'

"During the trial dramatic details have come to light about the resistence offered by the Orthodox, Roman Catholic, and Jewish clergy to the spoliation of churches. In one case as was testified by witnesses, the Roman Catholic priest declared to the Soviet agents who wanted to remove sacred objects from a church: 'You will have to pass over my corpse.' "

Pravda (Truth) a Soviet journal published in Moscow, quotes the following testimony of Smirnov, a high official in Petrograd, who directed the confiscation program:

---

[5] *The Times,* London, March 23, 24, 27, 1923.

"When the commission entered, Gritzko and another priest kneeled and began to sing psalms. They were joined by the parishioners. After they were repeatedly asked to desist and leave the church, it proved necessary to apply force and lead out those who opposed the sealing of the church. The crowd was in extreme exaltation and one could hear voices like following: 'The Soviet Government is not everlasting, but the Church will abide. . . .'"[6]

This is typical of the type of testimony upon which the verdict was rendered, or more likely a predetermined verdict approved. This verdict, when formally submitted, March 26th, concludes:

" . . . All the accused priests declared in the course of the trial that they held the enactments of the Pope to be absolutely binding for them, in questions of creed as well as with regard to the confiscation of the Church property, notwithstanding the fact that those enactments were in direct contradiction with the decrees of the Soviet Government. Likewise, the same priests declared in the Court that contrary to the clause 121 of the Criminal Code they did, and they were going to, teach the children so-called religion, and that they did not recognize the aforesaid clause of the Criminal Code.

"In view of the above the Court declares guilty:

1. Jan Cieplak and Constantine Budkievicz—of intentionally conducting the above mentioned counter-revolutionary activities of the organization of the Roman Catholic clergy in Petrograd, which activities were aimed at the opposition to the Soviet Government, the weakening of the proletarian dictatorship, the restoration of the old proprietary rights of the Church, and the instigation of the large mass of the parishioners against the Soviet Government, which granted the religious prejudices of that mass, led to anti-Government demonstrations; also—of refusing to comply with the Soviet laws and acting contrary to clauses 62, 119 and 121 of the Criminal Code. . . .

" . . . Therefore Cepliak and Budkievicz are sentenced by the Court to the highest penalty, viz., to be shot."[7]

The storm of protest following this pronouncement was so great that the government was compelled to await the final expression of European public opinion and the adjustment of a shocked international conscience to this new assault on Chris-

[6] *Pravda,* No. 63, March 22, 1923.
[7] *Izviestia,* No. 67 (1804), March 27, 1923.

tianity. Immediately following the publication of the conviction came the official announcement in *Izviestia,* the official organ:

"The carrying out of the verdict against Cieplak, Budkievicz, and others is postponed until further notice."[8]

The expected storm broke immediately and active measures were at once taken in behalf of the accused. The British Government seems to have led the protests. In a debate in the House of Commons, Mr. McNeill, Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs (Canterbury, O.), in reply to Mr. Ammon (Camberwell N., Lab.), said:

"A telegram has just been received from the British Agent in Moscow confirming the report that the Archbishop of Petrograd and one of his priests have been sentenced to death, and stating that it is feared the sentence will be carried out within forty-eight hours. (Mr. Newbold, Motherwell, Comm.—"Rats!") Mr. Hodgson has done all in his power, under instructions from the Government, to save these ecclesiastics, and I cannot see what more can be done if the Soviet Government is determined to carry out barbarities of this nature."[9]

In the flood of protests and public debate upon the subject, the Archbishop of Canterbury alone seems to have been moved with a consciousness of the greater issues involved. Speaking in the House of Lords he states: "They could not isolate incidents against individual ecclesiastics from the wider movement taking place throughout Russia practically against religion as a whole."[10]

It is because of this graver implication that the whole procedure is to be viewed not as a crime against individuals or an open attack upon the policy of any individual Christian communion. For that reason both the crime itself and the communistic attitude towards it call for this detailed discussion.

A. A. Valentinov, in his compilation of documents, *The Assault of Heaven,* has gathered together a number of docu-

---

[8] March 27, 1923. [9] *The Times,* March 29, 1923.
[10] *The Times,* March 21, 1923.

ments and dispatches relating to the trial. The following will show the sequence of events:

"Rome, March 28th—*Corriere d'Italia* learns that the Pope had applied to Moscow, at the very beginning of the trial of Mgr. Cieplak, through the American Mission, and obtained the assurance that even if the death sentence were passed it would be revoked." [11]

The *Times* reported in this connection:

"Rome, March 29th—The action taken by the Pope in regard to the proceedings of the Soviet Government against Archbishop Cieplak is considered to have been largely responsible for the postponement of the execution.

"His Holiness instructed Professor Walsh, Head of the Pontifical Mission for the relief of distress in Russia, to do all in his power to intervene on behalf of the arrested priests. Professor Walsh, who is also a member of the American Mission, succeeded in having the trial several times deferred and, further postponement being impossible, received the assurance that even should the capital sentence be passed its execution would not take place.

"This is the second time that the Pope has intervened with the Soviet on behalf of condemned ecclesiastics. As Papal Nuncio to Poland in 1919 he was successful in securing the release of the Metropolitan of Petrograd, who had been imprisoned and threatened with execution. The Holy See recognized Mgr. Cieplak and his companions as members of the Catholic Hierarchy, and as such entitled to the protection and help of the Supreme Pontificate." [12]

Telegram from Cardinal Mercier to the Archbishop of Canterbury:

"Have received a wire concerning the arrest of the Roman Catholic Archbishop Cieplak and 13 Roman Catholic priests in Moscow. They are all threatened with death penalty. Am addressing myself to Lord Curzon. Could you assist me?" [13]

Reply of the Archbishop of Canterbury:

"Thanks for your wire. I have already spoken with the Head of the Foreign Office who is telegraphing to Moscow. For my part I will use the first opportunity for interpellation in the House of Lords." [14]

Further, the Polish Telegraph Agency reported:

"It is reported from Moscow: The German Ambassador, Count Brockdorf-Rantzau called upon Tchitcherin in connection with the case of Bishop Cieplak. Tchitcherin assured the German Ambassador that

---

[11] Telegrams of the Polish Telegraph Agency, March 28, 1923.

[12] *Ibid.*, March 29, 1923.

[13] *The Assault of Heaven,* A. A. Valentinof, 1924, p. 11.

[14] *Ibid.*

the verdict would not be carried out and that the whole case would be the subject of discussion between the Soviet Government and the Polish Cabinet." [15]

The French Deputy, Herriot, has sent the following telegram to Moscow: "On behalf of the French democracy I earnestly beg you not to execute the condemned Polish priests."

Herriot tried to collect other signatures to that telegram, but many deputies refused to give theirs out of the fear lest their consent be interpreted as a recognition of the Soviet Government.[16]

Kurjer Polski states:

"On March 28th the eldest representatives of the Diplomatic Corps in Warsaw, the Papal Nuncio and the Minister of the United States, made earnest remonstrances in the Soviet mission in connection with the barbarous verdict. M. Obolensky promised to convey them to his Government. M. Obolensky was also visited by the German Minister, Herr Rauscher." [17]

Kurjer Warszawsky said:

" . . . It is something more than a struggle against the Roman Catholic Church. It is an assault on religion in general, a campaign against the teaching of Christ, against the moral foundations on which our society is built." [18]

In connection with the postponement of the carrying out of the verdict *Gazetta Poranna* wrote:

"The story of the trial of the social-revolutionaries has been repeated. As in their case, the carrying out of the verdict has been postponed 'until further orders.' They are still locked in the Bolshevik cellars where they are dying a slow death. . . . It is worse than death itself.

"The 'postponement' of death sentence has become a regular weapon in the hands of the Red tyrants with which they terrorize and blackmail the civilized world. In the meantime the wretched condemned will slowly die." [19]

As a final act the Polish Government made a formal remonstrance which ends thus:

"I warn the Soviet Government not only in my capacity of the head of the Polish Government, but on behalf of the whole civilized world which is unanimous in condemning this unprecedented act of violence,

---

[15] Polish Telegraph Agency.
[16] *Ibid.*
[17] *Kurjer Polski,* March 29, 1923.
[18] April 3, 1923.
[19] *Gazetta Poranna,* April 4, 1923.

that the responsibility for carrying out the sentence whose injustice is so utterly obvious rests entirely with the aforesaid Government."[20]

Having received this declaration, and quietly waiting till the storm of indignation was at last allayed, the Soviet Government, in perfect certainty that the above described excitement implied no real menace to it, addressed the following document to the European public opinion:

"The All-Russian Executive Committee having examined the petitions of citizens Cepliak and Budkievicz upon whom the sentence of capital punishment was passed by the Supreme Court, decreed as follows:

"The activities of citizen Cieplak, as established by the Court, were obviously and avowedly meant for the detriment of the working class; they were directed against the fundamental conquests of the proletarian revolution, and tried to abuse the freedom of religious worship which was guaranteed by the law to all denominations alike; they represent therefore a very grave crime for which the revolutionary republic, still surrounded by its enemies, has no other punishment but that applied by the Court with regard to citizen Cieplak.

"Taking, however, into account the fact that citizen Cieplak belongs to that religious denomination which in times of Tsarism and under the bourgeois republic was persecuted by the Government and that the carrying out of the punishment which he really deserves might be interpreted by most backward elements of the Roman Catholic population of Soviet Russia, whose religious prejudices were made use of by Cieplak and his accomplices, as directed primarily against their creed (the Central Executive Committee resolves) to substitute the sentence passed by the Court by ten years' imprisonment in strict isolation.

"As regards the other condemned, viz., citizen Budkievicz who coupled his religious activities with direct counter-revolutionary work under the auspices of a hostile bourgeois Government and used his position of a priest for crimes which are tantamount to high treason, his petition for reprieve is to be rejected.

"Signed: Chairman M. KALININ,
"Secretary T. SAPRONOV."[21]

The expressions of grief and indignation, as was to be expected, were prompt and vigorous. It is interesting, however,

---

[20] *For Freedom,* No. 70 (811), March 27, 1923.
[21] *Izviestia,* No. 70 (1807), March 30, 1923.

to note the nature of the Soviet press notices, as showing the depths to which a government can fall.

"When the trial of Cieplak began, a great excitement and noise was to be noticed among the German Center, the Polish anti-Semites, and the English conservatives. It is just possible that the order to make noise came from the very center of the Catholic reaction, from the Vatican. But at any rate not only the Roman Catholics but the higher clergy of all other denominations felt affected by the trial of Cieplak and deemed the moment opportune for a new attack against the Soviet Republic. In the British House of Lords, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the head of the Church which in its time knew no mercy toward Roman Catholics and persecuted them with the same energy with which the Catholic inquisition persecuted and burnt down the Protestants—now this very same Archbishop of Canterbury, who by his very position is a typical representative of the English cant, came forward with a question concerning the Cieplak trial. He was supported by the noble Lord Sydenham, who violently attacked the Soviet Government. Lord Curzon stuttered some answer on behalf of the Cabinet, to the effect that the British Government will do everything it can in order to, etc. Even in the House of Commons, which has not yet finished discussing the proposal of Snowden as to the peaceful transition from bourgeois to socialist régime, the noble representatives of the 'Labour' party—of the same lot that dined recently with the King—also thought necessary to put a question about the 'barbarous persecutions of religion' in Soviet Russia." [22]

"Roman Catholic Church is not the only instrument of capitalism. Its rule is based upon the support of other churches, too, as well as of the bourgeois press and even of the 'freethinking' science. 'Don't touch any of my servants'—shouts the international capital. And where the Roman Catholic priest, the Protestant pastor, and the Jewish Rabbi come to its defense assisted by the corrupted press and corrupted science —the simpletons and hirelings from the conciliatory parties are never lacking. Old honest Lansbury, Ben Turner, O'Grady, the leader of the English 'conciliatory' workers—they all feel disconcerted. They have not got the courage to break with the bourgeoisie and its hangers-on. . . .

"Old Ben Turner has sent us the following wire: 'Human life is valuable. Don't hang the archbishop.' English Labor press has not spent even one tenth of the sum paid for that telegram on a similar telegram of protest against the execution of South African strikers so brutally

[22] *Kurjer Polski.*

carried out at the orders of the idol of British liberalism, General Smuts. But when it comes to priests, the Labor party remembers that human life is sacred. And old Lansbury appeals to our magnanimity, thus giving a practical lesson to the revolutionary workers. . . .

"To all the threats of M. Sikorsky and the howling Polish bourgeois press our answer is short: hands off! Don't expect, gentlemen, that your howling will influence in the least the decision of the Soviet Government. The All-Russian Central Executive Committee, in its capacity of the representative of supreme authority, has ratified the verdict upon Archbishop Cieplak and other Roman Catholic priests; in doing so it did but obey the command of its revolutionary conscience and the interests of the revolution. In its opinion the sentence upon the Roman Catholic priests is entirely compatible with the notion of justice of the revolutionary proletarian masses. . . .

"The C. E. C. revoked the death sentence against Cepliak and changed it into ten years' imprisonment. But the same measure could not be applied to Budkievicz, who was an agent of the Polish Government and whose counter-revolutionary actions were dictated not so much by religious fanaticism, as in the case of Cieplak, as by the interests of the foreign powers. . . .

"The decision of the Soviet Government, of the Central Executive Committee, will be carried out. Let the international counter-revolutionaries howl as much as they like—that will not alter our decision." [23]

The mitigation of the verdict against Bishop Cieplak induced the official press to write the following lines:

"The mildness of the Soviet Government must not be falsely interpreted. Let everybody know that under whatever banner the active counter-revolution might hide itself, it would be ruthlessly dealt with by the Soviet Government." [24]

It has seemed desirable to single out this one defiance of the opinion of the Christian world to illustrate the utter disregard in which the Soviet holds such opinion. It is an attitude assumed not only towards religion but to all other international obligations and to personal rights and privileges. Father Walsh of Georgetown University, Director General of the Papal Relief Mission in 1922, an eye-witness of many

---

[23] *Izviestia,* No. 70 (1807), March 30, 1923.
[24] *Izviestia,* No. 70 (1807), March 30, 1923.

atrocities, speaking at a luncheon discussion of the Foreign Policy Association, New York City, November 9, 1927, referring to the disregard of international rights, states:

"And you must remember that when Mr. Voikoff was shot at Warsaw last June—I happened to be in Europe at the time—the next day twenty men were taken out in Moscow and shot without trial, as an administrative act of the G. P. U. The things that terrify are not seen in the street; they are done in execution chambers.

"Some nations protested against such barbarity. I have not time to read to you the official answer sent to the protest of one country; but the substance was this: that Soviet Russia maintains the right to execute without trial either its own or any other nationals who go into its territory; that the G. P. U., which is the State Political Police, the successor of the Cheka, possesses such power; and that all foreigners, who go there, go with their eyes open and must submit to such conditions. The fact that a state of peace existed between Russia and Finland (which is the country in question) did not prevent them from holding General Elkengren as a precious hostage to be executed when they saw fit."

PART VI

Interference in America

CHAPTER I. Russian Church at the American Bar

Appendix A. The Biography of Metropolitan Platon

Appendix B. The Biography of John Kedrovsky

CHAPTER II. The Disqualification of Kedrovsky

CHAPTER III. The Status of Metropolitan Platon

CHAPTER IV. Interference of the Karlowitz Synod

CHAPTER I

Russian Church at the American Bar

IN 1918, under conditions which had better be glossed over, Archbishop Evdokim, Archbishop of the Russian Orthodox Church in North America and the Aleutian Islands, suddenly left America. After an interregnum, his Suffragan Bishop Alexander Nemolovski was chosen by the clergy of America as ruling Archbishop. This was confirmed by a special ukase of the Holy Synod No. 2475, issued August 27-September 7, 1920.

In July 1923, it became necessary for Archbishop Alexander to return to Europe. At that time the Metropolitan Platon of Kherson and Odessa was residing in America. To him Archbishop Alexander intrusted the administration of the diocese, by a credential issued July 23, 1922. On September 29, 1923, this appointment was confirmed by a ukase of the Patriarch:

> "Ukase by Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias, to the Most Reverend Platon, Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa, temporary Administrator of the North American Diocese.
>
> "By the decision of the Sacred Synod of April 14/27, 1922, Your Eminence was appointed temporary Administrator of the North American Diocese. . . . At present, having been informed of the condition of the North American Church, we have deemed it indispensable to appoint you Administrator of the North American Church, releasing you at the same time from the (duties of the) administration of the Kherson and Odessa Diocese.
>
> "September 29, 1923, No. 41.
>
> "Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and all the Russias.
>
> "Moscow, Donskoy Monastery."

Oral testimony is also offered by Mr. E. T. Colton, Executive Secretary of the Foreign Department of the Young Men's Christian Association, that in response to a cable sent through him, the Patriarch orally appointed the Metropolitan Platon as his representative in America. The reasons for the legality of such appointment will be reviewed later.

In October 8, 1923, the Schismatic Sobor of 1923 appointed one John Kedrovsky, an American citizen and a married man, as Archbishop of America.

On the basis of credentials issued by the Sobor, Kedrovsky laid claim to the property of the Russian Church. The claim was carried to the courts, and on December 24, 1924, Justice Ford of the Supreme Court handed down a decision favoring Metropolitan Platon. The Justice based his decision upon the following findings:

1. The second Sobor of 1923 was not a proper and canonical Sobor. It was not called by the Patriarch, in fact "there is no pretense in this authenticated record of its proceedings (*i.e.,* The Bulletin) that the Sobor was called by the authority of Patriarch Tikhon, the head of the Church, who alone by decree of the Sobor of 1917 had authority to convoke it."

"From the record one would judge that the Sobor was a mere assemblage of three 'renovated groups' as they are designated in the *Bulletin.* Whatever other groups were represented are not mentioned. It is clear that those groups, the Living Church, the Union of the Ancient Apostolic Church Communion, and the Union of Church Regeneration, dominated the Sobor, as they had selected its president. No mention is made of the Patriarch except to condemn him. In place of the Patriarch, the Sacred Synod and the Supreme Church Council which were made the ruling bodies over the Russian Church by the Sobor of 1917, the Sobor of 1923 set up a Supreme Church Council as the sole authority. 'Afterwards,' says the *Bulletin,* 'there was elected the plenum of the Supreme Council according to the principle of proportionality of grouping: ten members of the group Living Church, six of Union of Communes of the Ancient Apostolic Church, and two from the Union of Regeneration,' a clear working majority over all to the Living Church."

2. Kedrovsky, as a married man, was not eligible to the Episcopate.

"The Council in Trullo pronounced against a married episcopate. True, that Council is not named in the catechism among those whose authority is accepted by the Eastern Church. But its canons were approved by the succeeding Council of Nice, which was the Seventh Ecumenical Council, and there is no doubt of its binding effect upon Russian Catholics as an abundance of testimony shows. Yet the Sobor of 1923 presumed to repeal this law of the universal Church and, in fact, the plaintiff Kedrovsky claiming to be an archbishop under the new Church, has a wife and children. Here is another ground upon which a pious Russian Catholic, whether prelate, priest, or layman, might reasonably repudiate the authority of the Sobor and its agents as being unauthoritative and outside the apostolic succession and hence outside the pale of the Eastern Church."

3. "There is a graver consideration in the attempt of this new Church, a product of the Russian dictatorship, to obtain control of a country-wide religious organization in America with hundreds of clergymen and branches scattered all over nearly all the states and having upwards of a quarter of a million members. The property used by the Russian Church totals in value an immense sum. If the Soviet authorities can gain control of all these, what a base for their revolutionary propaganda they will have secured.

"Reference to the *Bulletin* of the proceedings of the Sobor of 1923 clearly shows its community of purpose with the Soviet dictatorship in the work of instigating revolution and destroying this and all other governments to make way for a universal 'dictatorship of the proletariat.' This *Bulletin* is the duly authorized report of the Sobor's proceedings and is printed in Russia. It is in evidence together with a translation which unfortunately lacks the accuracy of expression of finished scholarship. But it is accepted by both sides as a substantially correct translation and I can only quote from it as it stands."

The Justice further quotes the impassioned statement of Vvedensky, and the preamble and resolutions of the Sobor, condemning capital and calling upon all members of the Sobor to uphold the Soviet Government.

In concluding, the Justice states:

"These considerations are not set up as a defense by the defendants. But the judiciary, oath bound to support the constitution, should not be behind the other departments of government in curbing the activities and the power for harm of the enemies of our democracy whenever, wherever, or however they appear. Self-preservation is the supreme law of govern-

ments as well as of individuals. Penal laws are on our statute books providing punishment for instigators of public disorder. Herr Most was twice convicted, once for an incendiary speech and again for inciting to violence through the printed page. He would not have been heard to urge in defense of his preachments that he was merely expounding his religious faith. Neither should these ecclesiastical propagandists of armed revolution be protected by similar pretenses. The criminal courts take cognizance of such offenses against orderly government, but the civil courts, too, should, I believe, wield their power to protect the state from the menace of insurrectionary propaganda on the high grounds of manifest public policy."

As was to be expected, an appeal was taken to the Appellate Division of the Court in January 1925.

Unfortunately, in both the original hearing and in the hearing before the Appellate Division no effort was made to introduce evidence that the Sobor of 1923 was not regarded as regular and lawful by other patriarchs and heads of autocephalous Churches. Nor was it shown that the appointment of the Metropolitan Platon to be Archbishop of America by the Patriarch in September, 1923, under the designation of Administrator, was a regular and valid canonical appointment.

The Appellate Division—First Department—in October, 1925, reversed the judgment.

The court based its decision upon:

1. Failure to prove that Metropolitan Platon had been appointed Archbishop for America by any competent authority.

The decree states:

"It is apparent that the Patriarch Tikhon had no power to appoint an archbishop. The power to make such an appointment was in the Holy Synod. The only authority for the Patriarch to act alone being given in Article 20 of the enactments, which is a veto appointment after a decision by the Holy Synod. Besides, this evidence of oral appointment would be of no avail against the rules of the Russian Church which forbid a bishop to exercise authority without written credentials. This ecclesiastical rule has existed from the early Christian era. *Index Canonum,* 33d Apostolic Canon."

2. The Sobor was legally convoked. In support of this the

decree refers to the evidence of one Dr. Hartman, which the former decree had referred to as mere hearsay.

"The validity," it states, "of Kedrovsky's appointment really depends upon the validity of the second Sobor, as it is called. There was testimony that the Sobor was properly called in accordance with a resolution in the first Sobor, called in 1917, during the Kerensky regime and admittedly valid, providing for a call of a Sobor not later than 1923. There was proof that the Patriarch had sanctioned it and its legality was never questioned by anything that Tikhon, the Patriarch, did. Dr. Hartman, a Methodist clergyman, testifies that the Patriarch authorized a committee or council to proceed with the work of convoking this convention, acting as *locum tenens,* the convention was convened by the Patriarch acting through the council, and also by the council which called itself, in its own convocation, the Supreme Church Administration. This testimony of Dr. Hartman was based upon the doctor's investigation in Moscow before and during the second Sobor, and he attended this council or Sobor as a representative of the Methodist bishops. It is not disputed that the Supreme Church Administration was the *de facto* administration of the Russian Church. Dr. Hartman stated that this was so and he could state it from actual observation.

"The evidence seems sufficient to indicate that this Sobor was legally convoked, and held and acted *de facto* at least upon the administration of the affairs of this Church. One Bogan, a native American priest, stated that the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople recognized the validity of the 1923 Sobor, which gives ground for finding for its validity.

"Plaintiff Kedrovsky's appointment as Archbishop and delegate of the Holy Synod is evidenced, not only by his oral testimony of the things done in Moscow, but by complete and convincing documents. Exhibit II is a certified copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Holy Synod at which it was decided to appoint him. The resolutions make it plain that his appointment would supersede any which Rojdestvensky might have had, by reciting that Rojdestvensky had never been appointed and was simply a usurper. Exhibit 12 is the formal "Grammata" or certificate of title to the office of Archbishop and the title of Metropolitan. It was orally testified that regular consecration services were held. The power of attorney appointing Archbishop Kedrovsky as delegate of the Holy Synod with full power, including authority to occupy and administer the premises mentioned in the complaint, was signed and acknowledged before Dr. J. F. Hecker, who was appointed a commissioner for this purpose by order of the New York Supreme Court sitting in this country. As to Kedrovsky's authorizations from the Holy Synod there is no dispute whatever.

"The Holy Synod has authority to appoint an Archbishop for North America and a delegate of the Holy Synod. The enactments of the 1917-18 Sobor enumerate under the heading 'Jurisdiction of the Sacred Synod, (2) confirmation of bishops elected to the diocese in their office, their appointment in proper cases and their retirement.' Under the heading, 'The Diocese, Its Organization and Institution,' it is provided:

"In extraordinary and exceptional cases, if the welfare of the Church so requires, bishops may be appointed and transferred by the Supreme Church Authority.

"In a diocese where a large missionary activity shall be developed and where many non-Russians are living, the diocesan bishops shall be elected among candidates who have experience in missionary work; otherwise bishops to such dioceses may be appointed by the Supreme Church authority.

"Bishops to the foreign missions shall be appointed by the Sacred Synod."

3. The decree refers to the regularity of the appointment of Kedrovsky by the Holy Synod. It is unfortunate that the defense did not place in evidence testimony showing that the Sacred Synod to which reference is made in the decrees of the Sobor of 1917 was abolished by the Sobor of 1923, and a Supreme Church administration created as the administrative organ. In July, 1923, the Metropolitan Antonin withdrew as Chairman of this Council and started his own autocephalous Church. He was succeeded by Metropolitan Evdokim of Odessa, the former Archbishop of North America, who immediately adopted as part of his program the change of the "Supreme Church Administration" to "Holy Synod." This was subsequently done, and it was this "Holy Synod" owing its origin to the Sobor of 1923, and not the Sacred Synod established by the Sobor of 1917, that gave authority to Kedrovsky.

Upon this basis the decree concludes:

"The second Sobor was convened with a jurisdictional basis in the Church statute and it is entitled because of this to the presumption of regularity. There was, besides, this secondary proof of its official status. All the procedural steps taken by the Patriarch and the Supreme Church Administration were shown to be *de facto* regular and this latter body

had both the Patriarch's approval and authority of its own to summon the Sobor.

"There was no evidence of failure to give due notice and all interested parties had actual knowledge so that they could have attended the Sobor. Affirmative evidence shows that the election of delegates among eighty million Orthodox people over all Russia and Siberia was free from outside interference. The other Orthodox Greek Catholic Churches as represented by their Patriarchs recognize the Sobor's regularity. To set aside the actions of the second Sobor under these conditions in favor of the shallow claim of the defendant Rojdestvensky, on the theory that the doctrinal necessities of the Russian Church require it, would put a civil tribunal of New York in ascendancy over the ecclesiastical authority in the decision of a purely ecclesiastical question with which it can have no concern.

"We hold that the second Sobor being in any event *de facto* valid, and Kedrovsky being the Archbishop appointed pursuant to its authority and entitled to occupy the premises in question, an injunction should issue forbidding his being excluded therefrom, and restraining the defendant Rojdestvensky from further occupying the premises, and restraining the defendant Turkevich similarly, and restraining both defendants from excluding the plaintiff Kedrovsky therefrom."

Justice Francis Martin dissented, making the following statement:

"This is a suit in equity. The plaintiff seeks to have the defendants restrained from diverting trust property from the purposes for which it was placed in trust, that is, for use by the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America. Since the trust was created it has been and now is so used.

"I am of the opinion that the plaintiff is seeking to divert this property from the purpose for which it was intended under the trust. He is the servant of a group who have reached a position of power in their Church organization through the revolution in Russia and by what appear to be questionable means. It is extraordinary that they should have the aid of a court of equity to displace those who are administering the trust strictly as it was intended to be administered.

"I therefore dissent and vote for affirmance."

Concurrent with the Cathedral case there have been a series of cases in equity begun by John Kedrovsky, then a priest, in October, 1918. The major case involves the title to 115 Church properties, the majority of which are in the coal

regions of Pennsylvania. The history of this case is, briefly, as follows:

Action commenced October, 1918, by John Kedrovsky to have a receiver appointed over Church properties under the jurisdiction of the then ruling Bishop, Alexander Nemolovsky. Case practically sleeping until Kedrovsky won the Cathedral case. In 1926, Kedrovsky made a motion to vacate receivership and to transfer 115 properties to him as ruling bishop.

1. *First Decision of Supreme Court.* Justice Mahoney granted Kedrovsky's motion on May 3, 1926. The defendants appealed.

2. *First Decision of the Appellate Division.* Judgment of Justice Mahoney reversed in November, 1926.

3. *Second Decision of the Supreme Court.* Case tried on merits before Justice Wasservogel, March 2, 1927. Complaint granted and judgment entered, ordering transfer of titles to plaintiff. Defendants appealed.

4. *Second Decision of the Appellate Division.* Appeal denied in February, 1928, with no opinion. Decision of Justice Wasservogel affirmed. Defendants appealed to the Court of Appeals in Albany.

5. *Decision of the Court of Appeals.* On July 19, 1928, appeal of defendant granted and opinion delivered *per curiam.* Judgment of the Appellate Division and judgment of Justice Wasservogel reversed, and new trial granted. Case now pending before the Supreme Court.

The decree of the Court of Appeals reads as follows:

John S. Kedrovsky, individually, etc., Respondent, v. Archbishop and Consistory of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, Alleged Corporation, et al., Defendants. Platon Rozdestvensky and Another, Appellants.

Decided July 19, 1928.

George Zabriskie for appellants.

Ralph M. Frink for respondent.

Per Curiam. The corporation known as the Archbishop and Consistory did not hold the legal title to the lands in controversy. It did not succeed to any title belonging to the unincorporated association known as the Archbishop and Consistory, for the reason that the latter association had no title to succeed to. The title was either in Archbishop Nemolovsky for the benefit of the faithful of the Church within his diocese or in the defendants to whom he attempted to transfer his trusts (whether successfully or not we do not now decide), or in the faithful of the Church themselves. In none of these views was it in the members of the Consistory, who were merely managers or advisers.

The order which is supposed to have established the rights of the body corporate was not an adjudication as to title. This is so even if we assume that the order so far as it goes is to be treated as a final judgment. Things were said by the referee in the course of his report from which we may judge that in his opinion the corporation had the title. The reasons leading up in his mind to the relief which he recommended must be distinguished from the relief itself. The decretal part of the order made on his report does not involve an adjudication as to title, nor was a finding as to title incidental or necessary thereto. All that the order does it to require the defendants who had acquired their title, if any, during the pendency of a receivership, to deliver the deeds into the physical possession of the receiver, and to execute such other deeds merely to the effect that since whatever title they held had been gained *pendante lite,* their rights and interests were subject, like those of any other purchaser in such conditions, to the final judgment of the court.

In view of the dissensions that have arisen, the Supreme Court may well conclude that the title should be vested in some other trustee who may be relied upon to carry out more effectively and faithfully the purposes of this religious trust (*Carrier v. Carrier,* 226 N. Y. 114). Whether such trustee should be the plaintiff, who is the present Archbishop, or the incorporated Archbishop and Consistory, or some one else, we do not now determine. This question is one to be passed upon by the Supreme Court in its discretionary supervision of the conduct of trustees. That discretion has not been exercised by any judgment yet pronounced. The case has been determined on the erroneous assumption that deeds to the corporation are nothing more than further assurance for a title already held.

The judgment of the Appellate Division and that of the Special Term should be reversed and a new trial granted, with costs to abide the event.

Cardozo, Ch. J., Pound, Andrews, Lehman, Kellogg, and O'Brien, JJ., concur; Crane, J., not sitting.

Judgments reversed, etc.

It will be seen by this that the right of Kedrovsky to continue in office as Archbishop of the North American Diocese as an ecclesiastical question did not come within the purview of the Supreme Court in connection with this decree. Hence it was not mentioned. The decree deals specifically with the title to property and the order for the new trial therefore refers merely to the title to those properties. The whole question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is still in abeyance.

Prior to the decision of the Court of Appeals in Albany, John Kedrovsky brought action through his agents and representatives in several communities whose Russian churches were not included in the list of titles vested in the Ruling Bishop, Alexander, and his successor, Platon.

1. *Meriden, Conn.* Action brought in March, 1928. After three weeks' trial, Justice Jennings rendered his opinion, denying Kedrovsky's right and vacating the injunction. Kedrovsky appealed to the highest court of the state. Case pending.

2. *Chester, Pa.* In the early summer of 1928, John Kedrovsky made a new attempt to gain control of the Russian churches of Pennsylvania. The Judge denied the motion of Kedrovsky for an injunction, case to be tried upon merits, now pending.

3. *Shenandoah, Pa.* Case commenced in 1926 in the Court of Common Pleas in Schuylkill County. Objection of the defendants to bill as presented was sustained by Justice Beshtell, and plaintiff given fifteen days to amend bill. Bill amended and defendants filed amended answer. Case now pending.

4. *New Kensington, Pa.* Action commenced in 1927 by an agent of Kedrovsky's. Defense prepared, and case still pending.

In other commonwealths all efforts on the part of Kedrovsky to gain possession of Church properties by recourse to law have failed. The most important decision is that handed down by Justice Newell Jennings of the Superior Court in New Haven, Connecticut.

The Court devoted three full court weeks to hearing of evidence. Lengthy quotations from the opinion are instructive. The Court said:

"Now, the case looks to me this way—we have this situation. There was a revolution in Russia, and political and religious and economical laws were all cast into tremendous confusion. From that we all hope that, in time, a stable and settled government will emerge, but I know of no one that claims that that time has as yet arrived. During these disorders there was erected on the old ecclesiastical foundation the structure which had its foundation in the Sobor of 1923. That Sobor undertook to deal both with the discipline and with the personnel of the Russian Orthodox Church in Russia and throughout the world, in dioceses under its jurisdiction, or claimed to be under its jurisdiction. The child of that

Sobor is, of course, the Holy Synod, which appointed this man Kedrovsky, and there doesn't seem to be any question about the fact of his appointment by that Synod.

"Now, we have this picture, that in Russia, and in the United States and the Aleutian Islands, in the first place, that being the proper seat, as I understand it, of the Russian Greek Orthodox Church, as a part of the general Orthodox Greek Church—we find a very slight recognition of this Sobor of 1923 and of Kedrovsky as its appointee through the Holy Synod. That degree of recognition varies in different places, but from the evidence, as introduced here, it appears that the recognition of this Sobor in Russia itself was by, perhaps, twenty per cent of the Church membership, or number of parishes, and probably then, roughly, correspond, and in the United States from an analysis of the exhibit introduced by Kedrovsky, that shows the churches adhering to his standard, I should say that the percentage was in reality very small in this country. When we come to Meriden, which is the battleground of this particular case, we find that the percentage is still smaller, and that all the substantial elements in the Church have no use for Kedrovsky or any of his works, and will under no circumstances recognize his authority or have anything to do with him.

"I further find that, while Kedrovsky was appointed by the Holy Synod which was appointed by the Sobor of 1923, that that Sobor was neither *de facto* nor *de jure* a proper Sobor in the sense of that term, of the Russian Greek Orthodox Church. As I say, in a case of this kind, I feel that the legal title must be clearly shown and that it has not been shown in this case. It seems obvious that the Patriarch was locked up and then, by some kind of undue influence, this alleged authority which he later denied, and which was very indefinite, anyhow, was secured from him, and while he was still locked up, they held this convention which from its actions went contrary to the former spirit of the Church in many respects, and, as I said before, has not since been recognized by the adherents of that Church, much of anywhere. Then, as soon as the convention was over and they passed these new rules, they let the Patriarch out, and he repudiated it and all actions therewith, and the people flocked back to him, and you have a real substantial division which traveled down throughout the organization clear to Meriden and split that church."

The validity or invalidity of the appointment of Kedrovsky is not a mere ecclesiastical question. By implication it is the opening of American doors to Soviet influence and propaganda. In the chapter on the foreign policy of the Bolsheviks

and the "Third Internationale" it is clearly demonstrated that the policy adopted by these agencies is a world-wide conversion to their program. At the last meeting of the "Third Internationale" reference was made to the growth of their influence, especially in America. If under these circumstances there is a canonical Church to which the Russian Orthodox Church in America has owed and still owes obedience; and if the lawful representative of that Church is displaced by one appointed by a new Church organization, created under Soviet patronage and acting irregularly and uncanonically; and if titles to Russian Orthodox churches are assigned to him, then as a matter of course the ignorant will interpret this recognition and the transfer of property to one bearing Soviet credentials and under an appointment from a Church created under Soviet influence, as an official recognition of the Soviet Government by the authorities of the United States. While this is not a logical deduction, it will be difficult to explain the situation to the ignorant mind. This presents an opportunity which the Communists have already seized. Fortunately, most Russian groups in America have been nourished in a spirit of loyalty to their Church; and have resisted all efforts of the Soviet Church to win their allegiance. At the Cathedral Church in New York City which for the time being is in the possession of Kedrovsky, acting as Archbishop of the Soviet Church, the congregation consists of little more than a corporal's guard. Efforts to acquire possession of other Church properties have been resisted by the Church members. After years of intrigue less than five of the two hundred Russian churches in America have been acquired by congregations accepting the authority of Kedrovsky.

The final disposition of the claims of Kedrovsky are still in doubt and danger still exists of the transfer of the legal titles of almost two hundred churches to him. The menace lurking behind this is self-evident. Properties will either be used by Soviet agents as centers of communistic propaganda under the semblance of legal recognition of the principles of

Communism, or, following the policy pursued in Russia, sold, or else converted into moving picture houses or dance halls. In either case there is little danger of disastrous effect among the Russian immigrants. Among the volatile groups from the more western nations formerly a part of the Russian Empire, however, the danger is exceedingly great.

With this possibility confronting us, it seems necessary to emphasize the fact that Kedrovsky not only claims jurisdiction through appointment of the groups composing the Sobor of 1923, but also by virtue of a power of attorney of a most inclusive nature issued by the so-called Holy Synod, which describes itself as an unincorporated body.

The diploma reads:

"DIPLOMA

"The Rector of the Church of All Saints, in the City of Hartford, Conn., Right Rev. John Savitz Kedrovsky, appointed according to this certificate on the 8th day of this October, is named as Metropolitan of All America and Archbishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands, and on the 9th day of this month consecrated in the City of Moscow in the Church of Three Saints by His Eminence Benjamin, Metropolitan of Yaroslav, and His Excellency George, Bishop of Dmitrov and Vicar of the Moscow Diocese.

"The Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church confirms this by the authentic signatures and the affixing of its seal.

(SEAL)

"For President of Synod
BENJAMIN, Metropolitan of Yaroslav

"Members of Holy Synod
METROPOLITAN TICHON
BISHOP GEORGE DOBRONRAVOFF
ARCHDEACON SERGIUS DOBROFF

"Secretary of the Holy Synod
ARCHPRIEST PAUL KRASOTIN

"18th of October, 1923, No. 2469."

The following quotations from the Power of Attorney are of interest and explain its nature:

"Power of Attorney, Holy Synod to John S. Kedrovsky.

"Know All Men by These Presents, that

"Whereas the Supreme Administrative authority in the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, sometimes known as the Christian Orthodox Catholic Church of the Eastern Confession, including all the administrative rights and powers of the Holy Synod of such Church as it existed in Russia prior to the All-Russian Church Council of 1917-1918, is now vested in the undersigned Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church subject only to the superior authority of the All-Russian Church Council periodically assembled, and the duly enacted statutes of said Church pursuant to which said Holy Synod has authority directly to administer the part of said Church known as the Archdiocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands or to delegate such authority to another, and

"Whereas the emergency existing in the affairs of said archdiocese of said Church resulting from the absence of any duly constituted diocesan government there and the confusion there existing calls for the delegation of the said authority of said Holy Synod to the Archbishop of said archdiocese in order to avoid any possible question as to the extent of the authority of said Archbishop, and

"Whereas the Most Reverend John S. Kedrovsky is the duly appointed and constituted Metropolitan of All America and Archbishop of said archdiocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands, having in addition to the powers hereby delegated to him, the rights and authority belonging to such offices of Metropolitan and Archbishop.

"Now, therefore, the undersigned Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, being an unincorporated religious association of more than seven members, having as its president Evdokim Merschersky, Metropolitan of Moscow, Russia, has made, constituted, and appointed and by these presents does make, constitute, and appoint said John S. Kedrovsky as Metropolitan of all America and Archbishop of the diocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands, our true and lawful attorney, giving, granting, and delegating to said John S. Kedrovsky, as such Archbishop, full power and authority as follows:

"1. To take possession of, occupy, and/or administer any and all real property belonging to said diocese or archdiocese of said Church in North America, together with any personalty used in connection therewith.

"2. To take into his custody and possession, and to use and apply for the purposes of said diocese of said Church, all personal property belonging to said Church and diocese in North America and all funds and monies thereof, whether held directly by said diocese or clergy

thereof or by any other person or corporation in trust for it, and to collect by suit or otherwise any moneys owing or belonging to said diocese of said Church, and to defend, compromise, and settle, or pay any and all claims against said diocese; and all persons having in their possession, custody, or control any real estate, personal property, money, credits or funds in North America belonging to said Church or diocese are hereby directed to turn the same over to said John S. Kedrovsky.

"3. To require an accounting and to institute suits for accountings or other relief against any and all persons alleged to have received or to hold monies or properties of said diocese.

"4. . . .

"5. To pledge the credit of said diocese for any purposes within the scope of this power of attorney or his duties as such Archbishop.

"6. To exercise all the powers and authority customarily exercised by the Archbishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands of said Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church prior to the All-Russian Church Council of 1917-1918.

"7. To institute all manner of suits, actions, or legal proceedings in his own name or ours or in our behalf in such form as the practice of the court where such legal proceedings are brought may require, but at the expense of himself as such Archbishop or of such diocese.

"8. To issue orders and directions for the holding of a diocesan convention of said diocese of said Church and to call the same and preside thereat.

"9. To transfer and convey absolutely in fee simple in trust, however, for the purposes of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, any and all real property, rights, or interests therein belonging to the undersigned Holy Synod or the supreme authorities of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, as fully to all intents and purposes as if such real property were herein described by metes and bounds or otherwise, the intent being to empower said John S. Kedrovsky as such Metropolitan and Archbishop to transfer the legal titles to all real estate or rights or interests therein in North America, which the undersigned have power to convey and also to authorize him in our name and as our act and deed, to sign, seal, execute, and deliver such deeds and conveyances for leasing or conveying such real estate or any part thereof, with such clauses and covenants to be contained therein as he shall think fit and expedient, hereby ratifying and confirming all such conveyances which shall at any time hereafter be made by our said attorney touching or concerning the premises.

"10. . . .

"11. . . .

"12. The aforesaid grant of authority, however, is in trust for the purposes of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in the diocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands and is to continue during the present emergency in the affairs thereof and until a diocesan convention of such North American diocese shall have been held and its acts and proceedings shall have been approved by the undersigned Holy Synod or its successors.

"In witness whereof we have caused these presents to be executed at the City of Moscow in Russia this......day of October, in the year of our Lord, one thousand nine hundred twenty-three, and our seal to be hereunto affixed.

"Metropolitan Evdokim Merschersky (Odessa)
"Metropolitan Benjamin Jaroslavaky (Jaroslav), Muratovsky,
"Metropolitan Tichon (Moscow)
"Archbishop Alexander Vvedensky
"Bishop George Dobronravoff (Moscow)
"Members of and Constituting the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church.

(Seal)

"Attest:

"Archpriest Paul Krasotin,
"Secretary."

"City of Moscow, Russia.

"On this 16th day of October, in the year nineteen hundred and twenty-three, before me, Julius F. Hecker of Moscow, Russia, Arbat Starokonyousheny, 39, Commissioner named in Commission issued out of and under the seal of the State of New York by Hon. Edward J. McGoldrick, justice, and dated September 7th, 1923, personally appeared Metropolitan Evdokim Merschersky (Moscow), Metropolitan Benjamin Muratovsky (Jaroslav), Metropolitan Tichon (Moscow), Archbishop Vvedensky (Moscow), Bishop George Dobronravoff (Moscow), Archpriest Paul Krasotim (Moscow), Protodiacon Sergius Dobrov (Moscow), to me known and known to me to be the members of and constituting the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church including the President and Secretary respectively of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Russia, and the persons cautioned in and who executed the foregoing Power of Attorney, and they severally duly acknowledged to me that

they executed the same as and for the act and deed of said Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Russia and all the members thereof.

"JULIUS F. HECKER, Commissioner, etc.
"Also in my presence
A. KORCORAN,
c/o Exchange Bank & Trust Co.,
Charleston, S. C."

This certification, by an American noted for his hostility to the Patriarchal Church, is of interest. It will be seen that the instrument itself is intended to be used as authorization to sue in courts of law for the possession of Church properties, a course which has always been condemned by the Canons of the Orthodox Church under penalty of excommunication.

This is of peculiar interest [5] because the canons of the Orthodox Church forbid recourse to civil courts to gain possession of Church property under penalty of excommunication. A similar law is also in force in the Roman Catholic Church and has recently been enforced in the State of Rhode Island. How much worse is it, therefore, for an ecclesiastical organization to base one of its earliest acts and its first contact with a foreign Church on a flagrant defiance of the ancient canons.

---

[5] There can be no doubt that Julius Hecker, a clergyman in the Methodist Episcopal Church, was duly appointed by Edward J. McGoldrick, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, as a commissioner of deeds, September 7, 1923, for a period of six months in order to take and certify the acknowledgment of proof of two certain instruments containing powers to John S. Kedrovsky, as Metropolitan and Archbishop therein described to convey real property as agent or attorney for the owners executed or to be executed respectively by Evdokim Merschersky and by members of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in Russia, relating to properties of said Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church in America. The application for this commission is made by Ralph M. Frink, attorney for Kedrovsky and William E. Holloway.

APPENDIX A

The Biography of Metropolitan Platon

IN order to give a more graphic picture of the two claimants to the Archbishopric in America, we append the following brief biographies of Metropolitan Platon and John Kedrovsky.[1]

Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvensky was born in Russia, in the Government of Kursk. He comes from a family of clergymen, his father being a village priest. In his youth, he displayed brilliant attainments and was placed in the Ecclesiastical Seminary. After graduation he entered the Kiev Theological Academy. (There were in Russia Ecclesiastical Schools of three degrees: the inferior or "The Ecclesiastic School," the Intermediate School or "The Ecclesiastic Seminary," and the highest school, "The Theological Academy." These schools correspond respectively to the High School, College, and University in American system.)

He began his career as a common village priest. His wife died soon after marriage, leaving a baby daughter. On becoming a widower, Platon Rozhdestvensky, according to the Orthodox custom entered the monastic life, choosing the oldest Russian Monastery, the so-called Kievo-Petcherskaya Lavra in the city of Kiev. He continued his moral and spiritual and mental training. While there he completed a well known dissertation on religious subjects, for which he was awarded the degree of Master of Divinity. In his long association with the Academy of Divinity, he was successively promoted; first to

[1] It is natural that the Metropolitan Platon as an historical character offers more material for a biographical sketch than the heretofore obscure Kedrovsky.

the office of Superintendent and subsequently to that of Rector of that Academy (Rector is the same as President of a University). While Rector, he was consecrated as a Bishop of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church on June 16, 1902.

After consecration as Bishop, Platon Rozhdestvensky was appointed as a Vicar Bishop of the Kiev Diocese, the oldest in Russia. The city of Kiev, situated on the river Dnieper, in southern Russia, commonly known as Little Russia or Ukrainia, is the oldest capital of Russia. Here, about one thousand years ago, the Russian people received the light of Christianity and were baptized under the first Russian Christian "Kniaz" (Prince-Ruler) Vladimir the Saint. Therefore, the city of Kiev, and the Kievo-Petcherskaya Lavra from remote times have been regarded as the stronghold of orthodoxy. Elevation to the Bishopric of Kiev was one of the most desirable distinctions within the Russian Church.

As a Vicar Bishop, Platon Rozhdestvensky was noted as a wise administrator, an eloquent preacher, and a man of high moral and spiritual qualities.

After the first Russian revolution of 1905, Russia became a constitutional monarch, with a legislative assemblage. The so-called Gosudarstvenaya Duma, or the Russian House of Representatives, was called early in 1906. Bishop Platon Rozhdestvensky was elected to the Second Duma as a delegate from the Province of Kiev.

Despite the short period of existence of the Second Duma, Bishop Platon so distinguished himself in the Duma by his high moral qualities that he was described from the tribune by one orator as "the conscience of the Duma."

In June, 1907, the Second Duma was closed; and Bishop Platon was appointed by the Holy Synod as a Ruling Bishop of the North American Diocese of the Russian Orthodox Church. He remained in America from 1907-14, when he was appointed Archbishop of the Bessarabian Diocese in Russia.

The North American See has always been considered by

the Supreme Church Administration in Russia as one of the most important dioceses. It should be observed here that the activities of the Russian clergy in North America were always, and are partly now, of a missionary character. The Russian Orthodox Church has always been in conflict with the Roman Catholic Church over the Russian Uniate. Russian people living under the jurisdiction of Austria in Galicia were under pressure of the Austrian Government and the Roman Church to abandon Orthodoxy. Thus a distinct organization arose known as "Uniat" *i.e.,* people who belonged to that part of the Greek Church which acknowledged the supremacy of the Pope. Many thousand "Uniates" as well as the true Orthodox people, were forced to take refuge from Austrian persecution and fled to America. Both the Russian Archbishops and those appointed by the Pope from among the "Uniates" have displayed ceaseless activities in America in efforts to retain the allegiance of their followers, and to win converts from the rival group. Simultaneously with the appointment of Platon in 1907, the Pope appointed and sent to America his own Bishop, S. Ortinsky, who in his first official message declared that he was appointed in order to prevent "Uniates" from returning to Orthodoxy. To meet the challenge of Bishop Ortinsky, Bishop Platon mobilized all the forces and resources of his missionary staff. He succeeded during the seven years of his administration in bringing many Uniate parishes under the jurisdiction of the Russian Orthodox Church.

Archbishop Platon reorganized this large Archdiocese. He enlarged the Russian Theological Seminary in Minneapolis, Minn.; and opened an orphanage for Orthodox children. The expenses of the Mission were necessarily increased so that in addition to the appropriations regularly sent by the Russian Government for the support of the archdiocese, it became necessary to find other means of financing the Russian Church in America. Archbishop Platon effected this by fostering the self-support in more than eighty per cent of the local parishes. This administrative ability of Archbishop Platon is of great

value in the present condition of the Russian Church. There have been no appropriations from the Russian Government since Mr. Bakhmeteff resigned his position as Ambassador of Russia, in 1922.

After the first Russian revolution the immigration from Russia to America reached its peak. Owing to a negative attitude of the Russian Government toward *émigrés,* Russian immigrants on their arrival in America were entirely helpless and subject to exploitation. To protect them against ruthless treatment, Archbishop Platon opened the Russian Immigrant Home, where many thousands of Russian workmen received food and lodging at a moderate charge. Through the Home, they were assisted in finding employment.

To meet the religious, social, and educational needs of the Russians, the Russian Orthodox Mutual Aid Society was formed under the blessing and support of Platon. One of the purposes of this Society was fraternal insurance. This department was organized on modern principles of sound insurance, through the insistence of the Archbishop, as its Honorary President, in spite of the objection of the members, who could not appreciate at that time the value of this reform.

Owing to these efforts of the Archbishop the society has prospered; and its funds now amount to a half million dollars.

The Metropolitan always boldly condemned in Russia the former restrictions on religious freedom; and fought for equality among the many races in former Russia. He denounced the persecution of old-believers by the Russian Church and massacres of Jews (pogroms), [see art. of N. Y. *Times* reprinted in the copy of *Russian American Messenger.*]

From 1914 to 1921, Metropolitan Platon was in Russia. When the Great War broke out, Platon as Archbishop of Kishenev (the capital of Bessarabia) made an appeal to the clergy to enroll in the army. More than thirty priests answered this appeal and enrolled in the active service. In order to show his sympathy in the regeneration of Poland, the Archbishop raised in his Diocese 5,000 rubles as a gift from the Bessarab-

ian clergy to the Warsaw Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church. From the Kishenev Archbishopric Platon was advanced to the rank of Metropolitan, a rank of Bishop next after that of Patriarch (there were normally only four Metropolitans in Russia), and was appointed to rule the Georgian Exarchate. (The Georgian Orthodox people were members of the Russian Orthodox Church, but their Diocese was given a more independent administration and was called Exarchate. Its head is a Metropolitan called Exarch.)

In March, 1917, the second Russian revolution broke out. It was followed with the fall of the Tzar and with the formation of the so-called Provisional Government, commonly known as the Kerensky Government, as distinguished from the old government. This Provisional Government, headed first by Prince Lvov and later by Alexander Kerensky, was composed of liberal democratic members supported by all classes within the Russian nation. All former dignitaries, both governmental and ecclesiastical, who had not accepted democracy had to resign, while all officials who had showed themselves liberal and democratic under the Tzar's Government received advancement by the Provisional Government. The Metropolitan Platon, who as the Exarch of Georgia, had been an *ex officio* member of the Most Holy Synod, became under the Provisional Government the presiding member of the Synod, *i.e.*, the highest Church Dignitary in Russia. He was called from the Caucasus to Petrograd and became the leader in the reform of the Russian Church.

The Eastern Orthodox Church, as distinguished from the Roman Catholic Church, is based upon the principle of administration by which all legislative and constitutional power of the Church is vested not in one person as it is in the Pope of Rome, but in a council of all Bishops and sometimes lay representatives, called a Sobor. In Russia, however, this principle of administration was abolished and the Russian Church since early in the eighteenth century has been administered, not by regularly called Sobors and the Patriarchs elected by such

Sobors, but by a body of from four to seven Bishops appointed by the Tzar, forming the Most Holy Synod. Such method of administration resulted in the supremacy of the State over the Church and led to the submission of the Church to the State to the detriment of its spiritual life. The first progressive reform of the Russian Church after the revolution was, therefore, the abolition of this method of administration and the restoration of the Sobor and Patriarchate. Metropolitan Platon was called upon to carry out this reform. He became the President of the so-called Pre-Sobor Council, a body called together to discuss the program of reform. By his strenuous efforts and persistence, he became the chief factor in calling the Great Sobor of 1917-1918.

Subsequently, Metropolitan Platon was elected to the Archdiocese of Kherson and Odessa. He continued in office until compelled by the French to leave, when Odessa was captured by the Bolsheviks.

In 1921, Metropolitan Platon returned to America as the guest of Alexander Nemolovsky, acting Archbishop of the Diocese.

Bolshevik influence extended to America. Many communicants of the Church became affected and left the Church. No regular allowance came to this Diocese from Russia. All communication with Russia was interrupted and the Patriarch could not exercise actual control over the American Diocese. Some priests and even vicar bishops were not willing to submit to Archbishop Alexander, whom they considered too young and without experience sufficient to enable him to rule the Diocese in such stormy days. Priests and laity turned to Platon Rozhdestvensky, whom they knew as a vigorous ruler and a man of high personal integrity, able to assume the burden of ruling the Russian Church in America. Bishop Alexander first invited Metropolitan Platon to help him. Subsequently Metropolitan Platon was appointed a *pro tempore* Ruler of the North American Diocese, April 27, 1922, Archbishop Alexander having left America after transferring his power to

Platon. One year later the Archdiocese received an order, signed in his own handwriting from Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow and All Russia, then in prison, dated September 29, 1923, whereby Metropolitan Platon was formally released from ruling the Diocese of Kherson and Odessa and duly appointed as the Ruler of the North American Church.

This second period of Platon's administration may be termed as that of liquidation of the mistakes of his immediate predecessor and of restoration of normal Church life in America. The Metropolitan was forced to assume the burden of continuing the defense of the Church against many pretenders, such as Bishops Stephen Dzubay, Adam Phillippovsky, and ex-communicated priests, including Kedrovsky and others.

After Platon Rozhdestvensky took control of the Diocese again, two conventions of the Russian Church were held in America, one in Pittsburgh, and the other in Detroit. Both passed resolutions recognizing Metropolitan Platon as the only person who could rule the Diocese and preserve the Russian Church against attacks.

When the Russian Cathedral in New York was taken over by Kedrovsky, under decision of the New York Supreme Court, both American and Russian people, clergy and laity, took opportunity to express their condolence to the Metropolitan. Numerous parishes scattered all over the country passed resolutions of protest against Kedrovsky and supporting Platon.

Metropolitan Platon is author of many published works, articles, sermons, etc. Among his scholarly works the best known is his dissertation: *The Ancient East Under the Light of Divine Revelation,* a volume of 670 pages, for which he received the degree of Master of Divinity. In connection with the anniversary of his twenty-five years as Bishop, the complete collection of his works was ordered prepared for publication in Russian.

APPENDIX B

The Biography of John Kedrovsky

JOHN KEDROVSKY, son of a Russian deacon, was born in Russia. He is a graduate of the Ecclesiastical School, the lowest school of its kind. He began his career in 1896 as a psalm-singer of a Russian Church in the Kherson Government. Subsequently, he became a teacher in the grammar school. According to the account given by the priest Father Cherkassky, in his record of that period, John Kedrovsky "by the order of Kherson Ecclesiastic Consistory of August 1, 1901, No. 9123, because for his drunkenness and assault committed against the priest and the deacon, as well as for violence and fighting, was condemned to imprisonment in the Biziuk Monastery." [1]

In 1902, he was transferred from Russia to America and appointed as a psalm-singer and teacher in Alaska. In 1905 he was promoted to the office of deacon and later appointed as a priest in Catasauqua, Pa. In 1908 he was transferred to Detroit, Mich.; in 1909 to Conemaugh, Pa., in 1910 in Troy, N. Y., in 1912 Coaldale, Pa., and 1914 in Brooklyn, N. Y., as rector of the Church of St. Vladimir. In 1918 he was transferred to Newark, N. J., and some time later returned to Brooklyn as a rector of the Church of Annunciation in Brownsville. Here he conducted Church services jointly with a suspended priest, J. Zheltonoga. For this, Kedrovsky was tried by the Diocesan Consistory and suspended by Archbishop Alexander Nemolovsky on the fifth day of August, 1918, by order No. 985.

[1] Information obtained chiefly from the official record kept in the archives of the Russian Church in America.

After his suspension he assumed the leadership among some twenty rebelling priests. In October, 1918, he began a suit against the Russian Church, asking that a receiver be appointed over the Church properties of the diocese. In 1923, he returned to Russia and was appointed by the Synod of the Living Church as the Archbishop of North America. On his return to this country in fall 1923, he attempted to take forcible possession of the Cathedral (15 East 97th Street, New York City), but was ejected. In 1924, he commenced a second suit against Metropolitan Platon in the Supreme Court of New York, details of which are given elsewhere.

As a member of the Living Church, Kedrovsky, by virtue of a special decree of the late Patriarch Tikhon, is classed as apostate from the Russian Orthodox Church.

Kedrovsky has published no learned works, sermons, etc., because of his meager education. The general nature of his sermons and addresses may be illustrated by the two affidavits. He is alleged to have said that "very soon the red flag would be flown from the White House in Washington, and to blame President Coolidge for his strongly negative attitude toward the Soviet Government (see affidavit of Mr. Theodore Flintuk, a copy of which was received from Mr. Koulibin, Russian lawyer and Vice-Chairman of the Unity Association of Russia).

CHAPTER II

THE DISQUALIFICATION OF KEDROVSKY

IN presenting the case of the Orthodox Church against John Kedrovsky two significant facts are forgotten. The first is, that already mentioned, that in the encyclical of the Metropolitan Sergius, officially released after his recognition by the Soviet Government, the Sobor of 1923 is ignored, and announcement is made that a second Sobor will be convoked to put in order the affairs of the Church. Since the followers of Kedrovsky rest their claims solely upon the canonical and political regularity of the Sobor of 1923, their case would seem to be closed.

Granting that the Sobor of 1923 was a local Sobor convoked in a canonical manner, and that its decrees were within the limits of justified domestic legislation, could they be enforced in America? Even casual acquaintance with the history of the Orthodox Church in America would dispel this idea. With the purchase of Alaska by the United States from the Russian Government, the Russian Church, already well established in the Aleutian Islands, followed its members into the country of their new allegiance. The Diocese of North America and the Aleutian Islands was created. From that time until 1919 no other hierarchy of the Orthodox Church claimed to exercise jurisdiction in the United States. Greeks, Serbs, Syrians, Roumanians, Albanians, and Bulgarians all looked to the Russian prelate as their immediate spiritual leader. With the possible exception of the Greeks, all recognized the actual jurisdiction of the Russian Bishop. Recently a Serbian Bishop has been sent to America, although some congregations still

remain loyal to the Russian prelate. The other National Churches have never formally announced their independence. The majority of the Syrians are under a Syrian Archbishop who acts as a Vicar of the Metropolitan Platon. Of necessity, therefore, the Russian Orthodox Church in America was compelled for many decades to be The Orthodox Church in America. Its constitution and its charters were based upon this assumption. Naturally, therefore, the only voice that could speak to united Orthodoxy was the voice of the United Church. No local Russian Church Sobor could speak in behalf of the other racial Churches worshipping under the aegis of that Church which providentially had acquired a position of Ecclesiastical Supremacy. Under the circumstances, therefore, it would seem preposterous to claim that a local Russian Sobor, which in its decrees departed from fundamental principles of Orthodoxy, could legislate for Syrians, Roumanians, Bulgarians, and Albanians in America.

Since, however, the arguments of Kedrovsky and the Soviet Church are based upon the regularity and canonicity of the Sobor of 1923, rebuttal must be found along the same lines. Professor Troitsky, with his usual thoroughness, has delved deeply into this question. Hence, we shall try to meet the Soviet claim as far as possible in his words.

The professor, with his unequalled knowledge of canon law and ready access to original documents and letters, has made a critical examination of the New York case. He is a Candidate of Theology of the Petrograd Academy of Divinity, Master of Theology of the Kiev Academy of Divinity, Professor of Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence of the Subotitski Faculty of Jurisprudence (Branch of the University of Belgrad), Expert of the Sacred Prelatic Sobor of the Serbian Church (Ukase of the Prelatic Sobor, December 3, 1925), formerly General Secretary of the Moscow Sobor of 1917-1918, and author of works on ecclesiastical jurisprudence.

After stating the sources of his information, he concludes:

"We must indicate those principles by which the opinion is guided.

The Orthodox Church has an organization somewhat similar to the organization of the United States. Just as this country is composed of separate states and has both federal and state legislation, so the Orthodox Church, too, is composed of separate, so-called autocephalous Churches. Likewise, the legislation of the Orthodox Church is of a twofold character—a general legislation, the organs of which are the ecumenical councils or a general agreement among all the autocephalous Churches *("consensus ecclesiae dispersae")*, and a local legislation, by one or another of the autocephalous Churches, for instance, the Russian, Serbian, or Constantinople Church.

"The general legislation is binding upon any autocephalous Church and cannot be changed by the legislation organs of the separate Churches. Its basic nucleus was formulated already during the first nine centuries of Christian history, and consists of the Apostolic canons, and the canons of seven ecumenical, nine local councils (Sobors), and of the canons of twelve holy fathers.[1] Local legislation is binding only upon that Church by whose organ it is promulgated, and it may be changed by the same organ.

"Since the case of Metropolitan Platon vs. Kedrovsky is not of a general Church character, but relates only to one of the autocephalous Churches of the Orthodox Church, namely, the Russian, it follows that the basis for a settlement of this case must be, first of all, the above mentioned general Church canons and after that the laws of the Russian Church itself, and mainly those by which the Russian Church was governed at the time of Metropolitan Platon's arrival in America, and these laws were the decisions and resolutions of the supreme legislative organ of the Russian Church—the All-Russian Sobor held at Moscow in 1917-1918.[2]

In view of the voluminousness of the present opinion, we give here a concise index of its contents, by pages:

1. Legal incapacity of the Sobor of 1923, because (1) it was unlawfully convoked, (2) not organized according to the canons, (3) issued un-Orthodox resolutions, (4) was not recognized by the Orthodox Church authority in Russia, by the Russian bishops abroad, by the autocephalous Orthodox Churches, the opinion of the Roman Catholic Church of this Sobor.

2. The subsequent history of the Living Church affords no basis for considering it the legal heir of the Orthodox Russian Church, inasmuch

---

[1] Their official publication by the Russian Church since 1839 has been the *Kniga Pravil* (Book of Rules). Our references are to its first edition, Petrograd, 1839, where the canons appear in Slavonic and Greek.

[2] We have also these laws in an official publication, the *Sorranie Opredielenij* . . . of the Sobor, 1-17, Moscow, 1918.

as only a minority of the Orthodox population belongs to it. It is of an anti-democratic, oligarchical caste character, leans for support upon the external force of the Bolshevist power, while correspondence exchanged with it by some Eastern prelates does not yet signify that it has been recognized as the legal heir of the Orthodox Russian Church. This is partly explained on the ground of selfish and political motives, and expresses the attitude of a negligible minority of the Orthodox world.

3. Kedrovsky is not a bishop of the Orthodox Russian Church, because he is married, was appointed by an illegal authority forbidden to act as minister, and there was no vacancy in the North American diocese, invalidity of the deposition of Metropolitan Platon by the Sobor of 1923. Validity of the personal appointment of Metropolitan Platon by Patriarch Tikhon, appointment of Metropolitan Platon in written form, Effectiveness of oral appointment, Recognition of Metropolitan Platon by his flock, and by the other prelates. The question of the rights of Metropolitan Platon as representative of the Patriarch, and of the rights of Archbishop Alexander. Conclusion."

The whole question referring to the legality, canonicity, and recognition of the Sobor has been given in Part III, Chapter III; while the Living Church and its legality are discussed in the Appendix of this book.

The Living Church makes much of its claims of recognition by other branches of the Orthodox Church. Even granting that these claims are justified, one must bear in mind continually, as has already been said, that this so-called recognition applies to the Living Church after its reorganization and not to the Sobor of 1923, or to the Living Church as organized at that time.

The fact that the intruding Archbishop of North America and the Aleutian Islands is a married man introduces the interesting question of the validity of a married episcopate under the present law and practice of the Orthodox Church. We must not forget in this discussion that the Russian Orthodox Church is a branch of the Holy Orthodox Church, and that a distinction must be made between the administrative acts which could be sanctioned by the exigencies of domestic economy, and the basic principles which govern the dogma, worship, and polity of the whole Church.

We are again indebted to Professor Troitsky for a scholarly and exhaustive treatment of this whole subject. In the course of his argument he states:

"The fundamental laws of the Orthodox Church, *i.e.,* the canons of seven ecumenical, nine local councils, and twelve holy fathers, do not prohibit the consecration of a married man, on the invariable condition, however, that he abandon married life upon consecration (Trullo, 12 and 48).[3] Those guilty of violating this provision are to be deposed. (Trullo, 48).

"These canons, binding upon every Orthodox Church, retain their full force (*Kniga Pravil,* pp. 83 and 103) also in the Russian Church, whose history has no record even of a single instance where this rule was ever violated. Since no such condition was presented to Kedrovsky, we must consider the very act of the imposition of hands, which was performed contrary to the will of the Orthodox Church, as expressed in these canons, as having a schismatic character, and it should be regarded in the same way as we regard consecration in any religious community that has separated from the Orthodox Church, for example, the Roman Catholic. Of itself, such an imposition of hands may be valid, but as it is performed outside the Orthodox Church it cannot give any rights in this Church to the one so consecrated, both in the hierarchical and property-right sense. I therefore consider Kedrovsky's consecration valid for the Living Church, but not for the Orthodox Russian, which follows the Trullo canons.

"We must also take into consideration here Rule 18 of the Seventh Ecumenical Council, prohibiting women from dwelling in the episcopal residence, and this rule has also been violated by Kedrovsky when he moved to the episcopal residence with his wife and children.

"2. *Was Kedrovsky unfit for the bishopric also for some other reason besides his being married?*

"Apart from his being married, Kedrovsky could not be chosen to

[3] Denials of the generally obligatory nature of the canons of the Trull Council are refuted by: (1) Reference to these canons as those passed by the Ecumenical Council, in the first canon of the Seventh Ecumenical Council; (2) the fact that they have been included in all official canonical collections. Attempts to misinterpret these canons in the sense that they prohibit married life to bishops only in certain cases, and not always, are shown to be futile by: (1) the perfectly clear text of these rules, and (2) the interpretations of Aristin, Zonar, and Valsaman, printed in the official codes of the Greek Church and the Athens Syntagma (tome II), and in Pidamon. All these are perfectly authoritative interpretations and followed throughout the practice of the Orthodox Church, and especially the Russian, where there has never been known a single instance of a bishop leading a married life without being condemned by the Church authority.

the place of a bishop because 'he was prohibited on August 6, 1918,' by the lawful authority of his bishop (later archbishop), Alexander, 'because he admitted to his Church the former Orthodox priest, John Zholtonoga, who had gone over to the Jacobite Bishop, Rene Villat, well knowing that Zholtonoga had betrayed Orthodoxy. This prohibition was never lifted.[4] Heedless of this ban, however, Kedrovsky persists in his priesthood. But according to the canons (Antioch, 4; Apostles, 28; First Ecumenical 5, etc.), a priest punished by his bishop may, if not satisfied, appeal to a higher instance, and if he wilfully 'will dare perform any divine service,' he loses the right of appeal and not only he, but all who maintain ecclesiastical communion with him, are to be excommunicated. To just this punishment it was that Kedrovsky was subjected on November 16, 1923, by the Sobor of the North American Bishops (*cf. Postanovlenia* of the Detroit Sobor, p. 49), and therefore, being outside of the fold of the Orthodox Church, he could not get any kind of jurisdiction in the same."

As a third defect in Kedrovsky's appointment, Professor Troitsky refers to the self-evident defect arising from the fact that he was consecrated by a heretical organization.

"I can briefly formulate my opinion in the case of Metropolitan Platon and Kedrovsky in three theses:[5]

I.

"Ivan Kedrovsky is not a bishop of the Orthodox Russian North American Diocese because—

"1. He was appointed to this diocese, not by the Orthodox Russian Church authority, but by a new religious organization known as the 'Living' or 'Synodal' Church, which was formed contrary to the will of the lawful authority of the Orthodox Russian Church, professes a doctrine which is not in agreement with the doctrine of the Orthodox Russian Church, has an organization essentially different from the organization of this Church, and has been officially condemned by the Russian, as well as other Orthodox autocephalous churches.

"2. He was appointed to a diocese already occupied by the Orthodox Bishop, and therefore his appointment was invalid.

"3. Already previous to his appointment he had been banned from

[4] The words cited in quotation marks are literally those from a letter to me by Bishop Alexander himself, from Constantinople, December 14 (27), 1926. This is also certified by the unanimous decision of the Detroit meeting of April 3, 1924. *Cf. Postanovlenie* of the Detroit Sobor, New York, 1924, p. 49.

[5] Theses II, III, are to be found on page 237.

the priesthood by the Orthodox Church authority, and then, because he violated this ban, he was excommunicated from the Orthodox Church, and for this reason could not hold there any hierarchic position.

"4. He was given the appointment when he had no intention and gave no promise to discontinue his married life, for which reason he would have been subject to unfrocking even in the event of a lawful appointment."

CHAPTER III

The Status of Metropolitan Platon

WITH the disqualification of Kedrovsky demonstrated, the question naturally arises concerning the status and authority of Metropolitan Platon. Professor Troitsky has also met this issue in his masterful and scholarly manner. The following quotations indicate his line of arguments.

Referring to the excommunication of Metropolitan Platon, he states:

"Not only do the canons prohibit Orthodox bishops from being judged by non-Orthodox bishops, but they even forbid the legitimate ecclesiastical powers to accept denunciations by heretics and schismatics. Rule 6 of the Second Ecumenical Council provides that:

" 'Whereas many people, desiring to cause confusion and subvert Church order, do maliciously and slanderously invent against ruling bishops certain accusations for no other purpose but that of staining the good name of the priests and causing confusion among the peaceable people, therefore the Sacred Council has deemed it well not to permit heretics to bring accusations against Orthodox bishops in matters of the Church. As *heretics* we designate . . . also those who, *even though pretending to confess our faith rightly, have separated themselves and are calling meetings against our properly consecrated bishops.*'

"For formal reasons, too, this condemnation has been ineffective. First of all, the rule that one should not be punished twice for one offense forbids that a priest should be subjected to such punishment twice (Apostles, 25, Basilius 32). Next, we have the rule of Cyril of Alexandria, which entitled a bishop on trial to challenge judges whom he may suspect; again, Rule 28 (14), of the Council of Carthagena provides for punishment of an indicted bishop only if he fails to appear in court within a month after he has been handed the summons, and after a careful investigation (Timothy of Alexandria, 6), and three successive sum-

mons (Apostles, 74, *cf.* Proceedings of Ecumenical Councils: I, 696, III, 561, 564), which was not the case in the present instance."

Replying to the claim that the Patriarch had no right to make a personal appointment, the Professor quotes rules 55 (66) and 120 (134) of the Council of Carthagena as proving:

". . . that the Bishop of Carthagena, as first bishop of the Church of Carthagena, has always enjoyed the right personally to appoint a bishop to any diocese, for which purpose he might take a clergyman from any other diocese; and Rule 85 (96) provides that he has the right to write and sign his orders in the name of all bishops.

"The decision of the Moscow Sobor of February 1, 7, and 9, 1918, provides that 'to foreign missions, the prelates are appointed by the Holy Synod' (*Sobranie Opredielenij,* 4th issue, p. 19)."

The following documents offered by Kedrovsky in the trial in New York seem to show that there is little doubt of the regularity of Metropolitan Platon's appointment under these conditions.

"Anthony Dashkevitch, new Alaskan Bishop appointed by Supreme Church Administration to investigate complaints, in place of Metropolitan Platon, was successfully rehabilitating archdiocesan affairs, but on arrival Anthony annihilates results already obtained and disturbances threaten to disintegrate and ruin archdiocese. Metropolitan Platon proposes to leave America which destroys our last hopes of reëstablishing peace and order. Overwhelming majority parishes entreat Platon not to leave. Humbly implore Your Holiness save our mission by confirming Metropolitan Platon as your sole representative with full powers."

(DEAN LEONID TURKEVICH.)

"Metropolitan Platon already obtained satisfactory results in restoring peace and order in archdiocese. Recent arrival of Bishop Anthony Dashkevitch appointed by Supreme Church Administration to replace Metropolitan Eulogius in his special mission badly complicated situation. Parishes are disturbed and party struggles are kindled again, involving eventual catastrophe of Russian Churches here. Please, by all means, obtain His Holiness Tikhon's blessing and order to Metropolitan Platon who is unreservedly devoted to Patriarch to continue his work in America as his representative with full powers. All prominent Russians here approve of such measure. We persuaded Platon remain in America until Patriarch's decision." (BOUIMISTROW-GREAVES)

International Committee of
Young Men's Christian Associations
347 Madison Avenue, N. Y.
"On Board S. S. *Olympic,* May 4, 1922.

"W. W. Bouimistrow, Esq.,
"350 W. 87th Street, New York, N. Y.

"*Dear Sir:* Just before leaving Russia, I received earnest cables signed Turkevitch, Mr. Greaves, and yourself. I was able to present them in person to the Patriarch, and received his favorable reply. It was not regarded prudent by either of us for him to send a written communication. This proved correct, for my papers were searched at the border. The Patriarch expressed it as his wish and recommendation that the Supreme Church Administration outside of Russia request the Metropolitan Platon to remain in America with the full authority asked for, detailing to the administration in Canada, Archbishop Alexander, and to the U. S., Anthony. He chose to make this in the form of a recommendation since the matter was already in the hands of the Administration, that he did not wish to go over their head. He asked me to convey his answer to the Metropolitan Eulogius in Berlin, and this I did last Sunday morning. In reply to my inquiry when an answer might be expected to you in New York, he replied that he would at once communicate with the Administration with headquarters in the Balkans, believing the final word would not be long delayed.

"I shall look forward to seeing you as soon as my engagements admit of staying in New York. Information is at hand, however, making clear that this will not be the case for at least a week after my arrival on May 10th.

"With kind personal regards,

"Yours sincerely,

"(Signed) E. T. Colton.

"E. T. C.—J.
"Dictated but not read."

Letter addressed to the Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa.

"*Your Grace:* Completing my letter of June 23d, No. 1108, I have the honor to inform Your Grace that Metropolitan Evlogi, who was requested by me, on account of your telegram, about the transmitting to him by Mr. Colton of the will of His Holiness concerning recommending you to administer the Russian Church Affairs in North America, has stated to me that Mr. Colton transmitted to his Grace

(Evlogi) a private conversation of His Highness, Patriarch Tikhon, in which His Highness gave only his private opinion. Therefore, on the basis of these reports, no order of such important character can be given as requested by Your Grace.

"(Signed) METROPOLITAN ANTHONY."

UKASE

from the Provisional Holy Bishops' Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad.

To His Eminence the Most Eminent Platon,
Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa.

The Provisional Holy Bishops' Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad, on August 23/September 5/1922,

HAVE DISCUSSED: the Church affairs in the North American Archdiocese in connection with the letter of the Most Eminent Platon dated 11/24 July, 1922, No. 596, and his short statement dated July 9/22, 1922, No. 595, concerning the situation of affairs in the North American Archdiocese.

Pursuant to the previous discussions,

RESOLVED: 1. In view of the will expressed by the Most Holy Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, that the Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa, Platon, assume the governing of the North American Archdiocese—which will was communicated by the recently arrived from Moscow Archpriest, Th. Pashkovsky, in his report dated July 1/14, 1922 (and in view of the consent of the North American Archbishop Alexander to transmit temporarily the governing of the Archdiocese to the Metropolitan), to consider the Most Eminent Platon to be the Provisional Ruler of the North American Archdiocese.

2. To instruct the Eminent Anthony, Bishop of Aleutian Islands and Alaska, immediately to leave for the place of his service in Alaska for managing his independent Aleutian Alaskan Diocese.

To send the ukases, concerning the above matters to your Eminence and to the Bishop Anthony.

August 27/September 9/1922, Serbia, Szemsky Karlowitz.

Signed: Chairman of the Synod, METROPOLITAN ANTHONY.
Secretary, E. MAHARABLIDZE.

To these should be added the following exhibits in the report of the same trial, submitted by the attorney of Metropolitan Platon.

[TRANSLATION]

RUSSIAN EMBASSY, Washington, D. C.
May 25, 1922. No. 828.

To the Chairman of the General Board of Trustees of the North American Archdiocese of the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church, and President of the Russian Church Relief Corporation, W. W. Bouimistrow.

Dear Sir: I beg to state that I am informed through authentic channels that His Holiness Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, in the end of March of this year expressed his wish that the Supreme Direction of affairs of the Russian Church in the United States be concentrated in the hands of His Eminence Metropolitan Platon, residing at the present time in the U. S.

In view of this fact I will consider that the activities of Metropolitan Platon in America have received the Patriarchal blessing and that Metropolitan Platon is the Plenipotentiary Administrator of the Russian Church in America.

Accept, dear Sir, the assurance of my perfect esteem and devotion.

(Signed) B. BAKHMETEFF.

Sept. 16-29, 1922.

YOUR EMINENCE,
Most Benevolent Archbishop.

The annexed letter of Stepanoff is typewritten on the typewriter on which are typewritten the papers of the American Archdiocesan Administration and it gives as address a church. Be so kind as to inform the author that, contrary to his information, you were recognized by me and by the Russian Synod abroad as a Plenipotentiary of the Patriarch, after we had received the information about the testimony of the Father Pashkovsky, and that I never villified the Patriarch, but that I am his boldest petitioner and defendant, as it can be seen from the No. 69 of our Church Journal. Cordially yours,

(Signed) M. ANTHONY.

TO HIS EMINENCE, MOST EMINENT PLATON,
Metropolitan of Kherson and Odessa.

Report of the Archpriest Theodore Pashkovsky.

Having had an opportunity to leave Russia and upon the wish of His Holiness the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia, Tikhon, I safely arrived in New York on June 30th (July 13th).

While living in Moscow during three months (from February 13th to May 11th, new style), before leaving for America, I had the happi-

ness on many occasions to participate in the Patriarch's services in various churches of Moscow and to call upon His Holiness in his rooms at the Holy Trinity residence. During one of such visits which I made together with the representative of the American Y. M. C. A., Mr. E. T. Colton—it took place, as far as I remember, on April 6th, new style—His Holiness pleased to issue a direction (order V. Gr.) that your Eminence assume the administration of the North American Archdiocese in view of disorders which were occurring then and which were sufficiently known to His Holiness. Accordingly, His Holiness charged Mr. Colton, when passing through Berlin, to communicate the above direction to the most eminent Metropolitan Eulogius in order that the latter should send that direction to Your Eminence in writing, which the Patriarch was not able to do personally in view of circumstances prevailing there at the present time.

I had the last opportunity to attend upon His Holiness on May 3d, new style, when I finally learned that I am authorized to leave Russia and then His Holiness pleased to send his brotherly greetings to Your Eminence and confirm his will that you should have in your charge the administration of the North American Diocese.

Believing that it is my sacred duty to report to you all above stated, I remain, etc.

(Signed) ARCHPRIEST THEODORE PASHKOVSKY.

No. 1. July 1/14, 1922, New York.

The Sobor of 1917-18 likewise made such an appointment possible in cases of urgency, excluding, however, the Supreme Church Council. This gave sole power to the Sacred Synod of which the Patriarch was president. In the event of either the Sacred Synod or the Supreme Church Council ceasing to function, this power was granted to the Patriarch by the decision pp. 63-67. Objection has been made that the appointment of the Metropolitan Platon is merely based upon the oral statement given by the Patriarch to Mr. E. T. Colton of the Young Men's Christian Association. Of this Professor Troitsky states:

"Under ordinary conditions, the oral form of appointment is not regular, because the opportunity afforded for the employment of the more perfect written form gives reason to question the very fact of the expression of the will here concerned. But under exceptional conditions, when there is present *vis major,* preventing the employment of the customary

written form, the oral form is recognized as fully adequate to note the expression of a will. Thus, for instance, the Roman law, the Byzantine and Orthodox Church laws,[1] as well as the modern law of many civilized states, recognizes the effectualness of oral testament if made *in precinctu militare, tempore pestis conditum, in extremis,* etc. Patriarch Tikhon, appointing Metropolitan Platon temporary Administrator of the North American Diocese, found himself in precisely such exceptional circumstances, being unable to furnish to Colton a written appointment of Metropolitan Platon, fearing a search by the Bolshevist authorities.[2] In vain do people refer to canons, alleged always to require a representative epistle of a bishop. Apostolic Rule 33 forbids the acceptance of *outside* bishops without such an epistle, and Rule 13 of the Fourth Ecumenical Council prescribes that representative epistles should be properly authenticated.

But Metropolitan Platon in 1920 was not in America an 'outside and unknown' person, having been at the head of the North American diocese before that (1913-1916). Therefore, the lack of a written form in the appointment of the Metropolitan Platon not only makes no difference in the validity of the appointment, but it cannot even serve as a presumption in favor of invalidity. The legality of Metropolitan Platon's appointment is direct proof of the legality of his right as temporary Administrator of the North American Diocese. And another very weighty proof, even if indirect, is the recognition accorded him by the entire Orthodox Church."

---

[1] Gajus, II, 101; Digest, XXIX, 1; Cod. Just., VI, 21, *erc.* Nov. Just., 48, cap. I; Basilios, XXXV, 11, 22; I, 25; Syntagma Vlastar, D. 4, etc.

[2] Indirect evidence that Patriarch Tikhon actually intended to entrust the administration of the North American Diocese to Metropolitan Platon is furnished by two letters from Metropolitan Eulogius kept on file at the Karlovitz Archives. The first (November 26/8, 1921, No. 369) mentions the Patriarch's letter of May 30th (June 12th), where the Patriarch writes: "It transpires that the Metropolitan Platon has gone to America. Perhaps he will disentangle matters over there." The second letter (June 3/16, 1922, No. 483) quotes the Patriarch as saying: "It would be useful, for the calming of the unrest, that Metropolitan Platon should take charge of the entire mission, and that Archbishop Alexander should go to Canada, and Anthony to Alaska.

A still more weighty proof of the appointment of Metropolitan Platon by the Patriarch as ruling Bishop of the North American Diocese is furnished by the letter by Archimandrite Anempodistes on file at the Karlovitz Archives, which directly mentions such an appointment. The authenticity of this letter was certified by Metropolitan Anthony, who knows the handwriting of Anempodistes. The close relations between Archimandrite Anempodistes and the Patriarch are proved by a resolution of the Patriarch published in the *Golos Pravoslavnoi Ukrainy,* the organ of the Ukrainian Living Church, for January, 1925, No. 1-2, p. 8, and dated May 5th (18), 1922.

Replying to the contention that recognition by those having no power to appoint offers no evidence of the validity of the appointment, the Professor states:

"The Court of Appeals declared that recognition by persons who do not possess the right of appointment proves nothing. This is not entirely correct. The Orthodox Church regards itself as a unit, as a single organism, where every part is bound up with every other part, and where recognition by one part obliges also the other part to such recognition and, conversely, repudiation by one part obliges the other to do likewise; and therefore the recognition of Metropolitan Platon even by only a few of the Orthodox Churches, in the absence of proof that he has been repudiated by any Orthodox Church, forms a presumption in favor of his recognition by the highest authority—the entire Orthodox Church. Metropolitan Platon, as an Orthodox Bishop of the North American Diocese, is recognized, as a matter of fact, not only by the so-called 'Tikhonian' Russian Church, but, first and foremost, by his own North American diocese, as witnessed by the latter's repeated resolutions and decisions, both in the form of decisions by the North American bishops alone and of Church assemblies of the clergy, as well as laity. On May 14/27, 1922, Metropolitan Platon was recognized as Bishop of the North American diocese by Archbishop Alexander, and Bishops Stephan and Aftimius (see *Amerikanski Pravoslavny Viestnik,* May 27, 1922, No. 12, pp. 66-70). On May 25-27 of the same year, a Sobor of the clergy and laity attended by 168 parishes, and with written declarations received from thirty more parishes, extended the same recognition; also, a meeting of bishops at New York on April 17-23, 1923, and the Detroit Sobor of the clergy and laity on April 19, 1924.

"The recognition of Metropolitan Platon by the North American diocese has especial significance because the above mentioned resolution of the Holy Patriarch, Synod, and Council, dated October 7/20, 1920, No. 362, entitles a vacant diocese, in case of interrupted communication with the Supreme Church Administration, to address itself directly, either through its own diocesan council or through its clergy and laity, to the neighboring diocesan prelate, who either personally or by delegating his vicar will take over the administration of such a diocese (see Paragraph 7 in connection with 2 and 4).

"Now, the North American diocese was precisely in such a state, for (1) it was deprived of its own prelate through the departure of Archbishop Alexander and, (2) its communication with the Supreme Church Authority in Russia was at times entirely interrupted and at times very difficult. This is witnessed, among other things, by the epistle of Patri-

arch Tikhon of January 17/30, 1922, No. 76, to Patriarch Gregory of Antioch, saying: 'The disorganization of our communications with our ecclesiastical mission in North America, whence reports have begun to reach us only recently . . . have prevented us until now from learning the views of the leaders of the Russian ecclesiastical mission to North America in this matter (*i.e.,* the Syrian diocese in America. See *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1922, No. 5) and others. . . .' The canonical warrant for this act is Rule 17 (24) of the Council of Carthagena, providing that very remote dioceses shall have their primates, *i.e.,* metropolitans, chosen by the local bishops themselves. And America, of course, is far more distant from Russia than is Mauritania, which served as the occasion for the promulgation of this Carthagenian rule.

"Recognition has always been accorded and is still being accorded to Metropolitan Platon by all Russian bishops abroad, as a whole, who are getting together at periodical meetings of councils, and who have more than once met at Karlovetz in Jugo-Slavia. Thus, the resolution of the Supreme Church Administration at Karlovetz of September 23 (5) reads: 'In view of Patriarch Tikhon's will and the consent of Archbishop Alexander (expressed in his letter of June 7/20, 1922), we consider Metropolitan Platon temporary Administrator of the North American diocese.' See also: Ukase of the Karlovetz Prelatic Synod, February 15/28, 1923, No. 148, on the appointment of Platon as Ruling Bishop to the North American diocese; Ukase of the Archepiscopal Sobor of June 20-July 3, 1923, that 'the decision of August 23-September 5, 1922, on the recognition of Metropolitan Platon as temporary Administrator of the North American diocese shall be confirmed;' epistle of the same Sobor issued October 9/22, 1924, published in the *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 19-20, pp. 1-3, and addressed to all the flocks of the Orthodox Russian Greek Catholic Church, declaring that Metropolitan Platon is the legitimate prelate for America and styling Kedrovsky a pretender and fraud (p. 3) ; and in an article entitled *O Russkoi Pravoslavnoi Eparkhii v Sievernoi Amerikie,* published in the *Tserkovnyia Viedomosti,* 1926, No. 9-10, p. 9, Metropolitan Platon is referred to as 'the legitimate head of the Russian diocese in America.'

"Lastly, Metropolitan Platon was recognized also by the heads of the autocephalous Orthodox Churches which maintained communion with him."

The propriety of the appointment of Archbishop Alexander as Ruling Bishop of the North American Diocese is beyond all doubt. Archbishop Alexander sent me from Con-

stantinople the original of the following Ukase of his appointment:

"UKASE

"To the *pro tempore* Administrator of the North American diocese, the Most Reverend Alexander, Bishop of Canada.

"With the blessing of the Most Holy Patriarch, the Holy Synod adopted the decision to fill the vacancy of the post of the North American Archbishop, in view of the telegram received in this connection from New York.

"It has been resolved that Your Eminence shall be appointed Archbishop of North America, which is to be brought to your notice by this Ukase.

"August 27 (September 7), 1920, No. 2475.

"METROPOLITAN SERGIUS, Member of Synod,
"P. SMERDYNSKI, Chief Clerk."

The Professor summarizes his arguments in favor of Metropolitan Platon thus:

"II

"Metropolitan Platon Rozhdestvenski is an Orthodox Russian Bishop lawfully administering the North American diocese, because—

"1. He has been appointed to this diocese by the legitimate, supreme authority of the Orthodox Russian Church.

"2. He administers this diocese in conformity with the will of its absent Archbishop, Alexander Nemolovski.

"3. He has been recognized as the lawfully administering Bishop of the North American diocese by the bishops, lower clergy, and lay members of this diocese, as well as by all the Russian bishops residing abroad and by the other autocephalous Orthodox Churches."

"III

"From the above two theses it follows as an inevitable conclusion that the surrender of the property of the Orthodox Russian North American diocese to Ivan Kedrovsky constitutes a deflection of such property from its proper use."

The following letter, from Metropolitan Anthony, a copy of which was sent under official seal to the author and is still in his possession, fully explains the position of the Karlowitz Synod.

President of the Episcopal Synod of the
Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia
No. 3613.
28th December, 1925.
10th January, 1926.
Srem. Karlovci. S.H.S.

To the President of the Court of Appeals of New York.

Being informed about the decision of the Appellate Division in favor of John Kedrovsky, who calls himself Archbishop, in the name of the Episcopal Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia, I protest against this unjust decision.

John Kedrovsky is an agent of the bolsheviks and comes by appointment of the dissenting Synod of the Living Church, which usurped the title of the Holy Synod of the time of the empire. This Synod is not acknowledged by the Russian Orthodox Church, neither by its clerical nor lay part, and so it is but a self-appointed assembly of dissenters from the Russian Orthodox Church, at the head of which was the Holy Patriarch Tikhon of Moskow and of All Russia. Till his death he was acknowledged by all the Russian people and the hierarchs of the Russian Church as her head, and by all the autocephalous Churches. That can be seen from the epistles of the Holy Eastern Patriarchs sent to me on different occasions and also upon the death of the Patriarch Tikhon. And the Holy Synod and the Convocation of the Great Church of Constantinople, with His Grace Meletios IV as president in 1923 declared the Holy Patriarch Tikhon in the name of all Orthodoxy the Confessor. Now his lawful successor is His Grace the Metropolitan Peter.

Patriarch Tikhon, the lawful authority of the Church, duly appointed the Metropolitan Platon to be the head of the Orthodox Eastern Church in America, and Metropolitan Platon is acknowledged as such by the Council of thirty-seven bishops of the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia.

The deposition of the Metropolitan Platon by the Court would be an act of a real unjustness, having neither canonical nor lawful reason.

We hope that our explanation will be duly considered when the case is reviewed by the Court of Appeals.

President of the Episcopal Synod
Metropolitan Anthony.
Head of the Synod's Office
E. Makharoblidze.

The author was enabled in 1924 to determine the attitude of various Church dignitaries towards the Metropolitan

Platon. He carried a message from Metropolitan Platon successively to Photios, Patriarch of Alexandria, Damianos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, Gregorios, Patriarch of Antioch, Basil, Patriarch of Constantinople, Chrysostomos, Metropolitan of Greece, Meletios, former Patriarch of Constantinople, at that time a refugee at Mount Athos, to Metropolitan Anthony of Kief, at that time living in Karlowitz, to the Secretary of Demetrios, Patriarch of Serbia, to Dr. Janich, Minister of Religion for Jugo-Slavia, to Dosetej, Bishop of Nisch, then living in Prague, to the Ministry of Religion of Jugo-Slavia, and Bishop Platon, acting for the Roumanian Patriarch during his absence, to the Ministry of Religion in Sophia, acting during the illness of the Exarch, and to the Metropolitan of Thyatira, acting as the representative of the Patriarch of Constantinople in London. In none of the discussions taking place in connection with this message was there the slightest suggestion that Metropolitan Platon was not considered by them as the lawful head of the Russian Church in America. In frequent conversations with the Metropolitan Anthony of Kief in London at the time of sixteenth hundredth anniversary of the Council of Nicea in 1925, again with the Patriarch Photios of Alexandria in England and at Stockholm, with the Metropolitan of Sibiu and Metropolitan of Sophia, the Metropolitan of Nubia, and the many theologians at the Stockholm Conference in 1925 and at the Conference of Old Catholics at Berne the same year, the name of Metropolitan Platon was often used; but never was it even hinted that his position in America was doubtful.

Additional confirmation of the recognition of the Metropolitan Platon as Ruling Archbishop is found in communications since correspondence has been opened between the Metropolitan Sergius and the Metropolitan Eulogius, Ruling Archbishop of Western Europe and the Diocesan administration of the Russian Orthodox Church in Western Europe. These communications, it must be remembered, are maintained with the knowledge and consent of the Soviet Government.

In No. 97, May 27, 1927, under the Patriarch's seal, the Metropolitan Sergius informs the Metropolitan Eulogius of the action of the Sacred Synod agreeing to terms of the registration of the Patriarch's Sacred Synod. Immediately upon the receipt of this document a certified copy is ordered to be sent by the Diocesan administration of the Russian Orthodox Church in Western Europe to Metropolitan Platon. This will be found in Part IV, Chapter III.

When the Metropolitan Eulogius received the ukase regarding the Metropolitan Anthony and the Karlowitz Synod, mentioned in Part VI, Chap. IV, the Diocesan Administration again ordered that a copy be sent the Metropolitan Platon. This was done under the seal of the administration in which the last paragraph is the same as that used above. The same course was followed in communication to the Metropolitan Platon the contents of document 96 July 14, 1927, of the Metropolitan Sergius regarding his acceptance of the program of the Patriarchal Synod.

As a matter of fact the present position of Metropolitan Sergius and the recognition accorded him by the Soviet Government carries with it a condemnation of Kedrovsky as the creature of the Sobors of 1923 and 1925, which the Metropolitan ignores. This has been done, as we have already seen in the ukase of Metropolitan Sergius, July 16/29, 1927, in which he expressly states his intention of calling a second Sobor, that is one succeeding the first Sobor of 1917-1918.

CHAPTER IV

Interference of the Karlowitz Synod

ADDITIONAL confusion has been introduced into the complex situation by the interference of a Synod of *Émigré* Bishops who have accepted the hospitality of the Serbian Patriarch, and are living in and around an old monastery in Karlowitz a few miles north of Belgrade.

This is the continuation of a Synod organized through urge of necessity in 1919. At that time Northern Russia was in possession of the Red Army and Southern Russia almost untouched by the Bolsheviks. To meet the needs of the Church thus cut off from the Patriarch and his Synod, the southern Bishops organized a temporary Synod under the presidency of Metropolitan Platon, then of Kherson and Odessa. The hope of victory was so glowing that Metropolitan Platon came to America in order to place before President Wilson the need of international coöperation and to make plans for the development of his Diocese. All the plans of the Metropolitan were based upon his faith in the triumph of the Provisional Government. The writer was in frequent conferences with the Metropolitan; and accompanied him on his visit to President Wilson. The President was conversant with all the details of the Russian situation, displaying a knowledge not only of the strength and bright prospects of the Armies of General Denikin which were approaching Moscow, but of the forces of General Koltchak which were moving westward. He expressed his hopefulness in the outcome and wish that some help could be given. The help required at this time was not an army of

aggression, but sufficient forces to police the rear guard against the general warfare of the Green Army. The outcome was sudden and catastrophic. The marauding forces prevented the maintenance of supplies of food and ammunition with the consequent collapse and disastrous retreat of the White Army. This is mentioned to show that conditions warranted the creation of a Synod for South Russia at that time. They served under a *de facto* government while the Patriarch remained in the district held by Revolutionary forces.

As the armies retreated many of the Bishops deserted their flocks and fled to Constantinople.

Later, the group of *Émigré* Bishops moved to Karlowitz where they created a Synod electing Metropolitan Anthony of Kiev as President in place of Metropolitan Platon.

This Synod in some way conceived the idea that it carried with it plenary power to act in the name of the Russian Church in all matters outside of Russia. This is a rather startling claim. There is abundant canonical authority for Bishops of contiguous dioceses organizing a temporary Synod, when cut off from contact with the main body of their Church. There is, however, no known authority for a group of Bishops assuming jurisdiction in a foreign land without direct appointment or direction from their Superior.[7]

As an advisory committee during a period of confusion the Karlowitz Synod was in a position to render great service. The Metropolitan Anthony is a man of great sanctity, the outstanding scholar in the Russian Church, and natural leader of men. The writer has had the privilege of being a guest of the

---

[7] The pamphlets relating to the Karlovitz trouble:

1. Peter J. Popoff, *The Karlovich Trouble,* published in Dorpat (Youriev), 1927.
2. *The Canonic Position of the Russian Orthodox Church Abroad,* published by the Diocesan Administration of the West-European Metropolitan District, Paris, 1927. The name of the author is not shown.

Both pamphlets are against the Karlovitz Synod and criticize it because of its non-compliance with the orders of the Most Holy Patriarch. The pamphlets are written in the Russian Language.

Metropolitan at Karlowitz, has traveled with him from Cairo to Jerusalem, and was with him frequently in England and Wales. In all interviews he displayed a great interest in the welfare of the Russian Church in America, but no disposition to interfere. It was manifest between my first and final interviews, however, that the Metropolitan's attitude towards the Metropolitan Platon had undergone a change. This was doubtless due to the appointment by the Patriarch of the Metropolitan Eulogius, formerly of Volynia, as Supreme head of the Russian Church in Europe and of Platon as the head of the Church in America.

The reasons leading to these appointments are shown in the following quotation from Spinka to which reference has already been made:

"Nothing really worse could have happened at the time than what did happen: the *émigré* clergy, most of whom had left in the wake of the White Guard armies, held in December, 1921, a Sobor in Karlovtsi, in the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and their irresponsible decrees rendered the situation in Russia decidedly worse. The Sobor was attended by nine archbishops, an archimandrite, and other high-placed ecclesiastics, most of whom had left Russia with the retreating armies of the would-be restorers of the ancient régime, such as Denikin, Wrangel, and others. Aside from the ecclesiastics, the Sobor was attended by a goodly number of former Tzarist officials and officers of the Tzarist and White Guard armies, as well as members of the Black Hundred party; the former ober-procurator of the Holy Synod, Count Volzhin; secretary of the tzar, Count Apraksin; the head of the general staff of the Wrangel army, General Arkhangel'sky; a former member of the governmental Council, Prince Putyatin; a minister in the Kolchak government, Lokot, and many others. The total number in attendance at the Sobor reached almost one hundred.[8]

"The Sobor elected as its president the most outstanding opponent of the Soviet régime and leader of the conservative party within the Russian Church, Metropolitan Anthony (Khrapovitsky), formerly of Kiev and Galicia, who, as will be remembered, was probably the chief candidate for the patriarchal cowl at the Sobor of 1917. His election to the presidency of the Karlovtsi Sobor was characteristic of the spirit dominating this assembly. What wonder that this group should adopt the

[8] *Cf.* Krasikov, *On the Church Front,* p. 187; also pp. 221-22 (in Russian).

extremely unwise political measure, resulting in untold injury to the interests of the Church in Russia, in the Message of the Church Sobor, demanding the restoration of the monarchical government in Russia. At first, two-thirds of the members demanded an explicit statement that the throne be occupied by 'a lawful Orthodox Tzar of the house of Romanov'; but this measure was opposed by the remaining one-third as unwise, and as tending to jeopardize, by tying it too closely with the fortunes of the commonly hated former imperial dynasty, the very goal desired—the restoration of the monarchy. The resolution was adopted, nevertheless, in accordance with the desires of the majority, *i.e.,* in favor of the inclusion of a specific reference to the house of Romanov.

"The Sobor also appealed to the army of Baron Wrangel to hold itself in readiness for the execution of its program. Besides, the president of the Sobor, Metropolitan Anthony, issued a proclamation in January, 1922, appealing in the name of the Sobor to the Genoa Conference which was just then in session, and through it to the world:

"'. . . If during this conference, or afterwards, the Bolshevik régime in Russia should receive recognition as the legitimate one, there will result Bolshevik uprising in one country after another. Their success or prevention depends upon the following measures: (1) upon non-recognition of Bolsheviks on the part of all governments; (2) upon the terrible havoc wrought by the famine, cold, and epidemic at present devastating Russia, which has been caused by the Bolshevik mismanagement. Peoples of Europe, and of the world, have pity upon this nation, and equip its sons with arms; then they, together with their dear comrades—officers, generals, and soldiers—will be ready to spring up and march into Russia, to rescue it from its enslavement by the robbers!

"'ANTHONY, Bishop of Galicia and Kiev,

"'President of the Russian Ecclesiastical Administration Abroad.'[9]

"This unhappy and highly compromising incident was used to excellent advantage by the authorities, who stressed the Sobor's reference to the famine as a proof that the Church deliberately exploited the calamity by using it for the overthrow of the government. It has never been proven, I think, that Patriarch Tikhon had ever been in collusion with the Karlovtsi Sobor; but superficially viewed, the fact that a group of the Russian clergy, with such important leaders among them as was Anthony, could pass such pronouncements as were passed at Karlovtsi, was supremely damaging to the Church at home, and the charge of collusion has been repeatedly made. Even such a highly placed official of the Commissariat of Justice as was Krasikov directly indicted, in his

[9] Quoted from a speech of Krasikov at the trial of Metropolitan Benjamin in *Revolution and the Church,* 1-3, 1923, p. 83 (in Russian).

book *On the Church Front,*[10] Patriarch Tikhon with having had full knowledge of the proceedings at Karlovtsi, and having secretly collaborated with the leaders there; he peremptorily demanded that the Patriarch either acknowledge his direct connection with his subordinates who had met at the Karlovtsi Sobor, or 'excommunicate them for conspiracy and treason.' Patriarch Tikhon protested that he could not excommunicate anyone who was not living within his territorial jurisdiction; this may have been canonically correct, but it did not help to allay the very real suspicion which lurked in the minds of the authorities. The Karlovtsi incident was a most powerful factor in bringing on the crisis which culminated in the spring of 1922.

"The action of the Karlovtsi Sobor was severely criticized even by some *émigrés* themselves, for to the more moderate elements among them it was obvious what a disastrous effect the pronouncement must necessarily produce in Russia. The former minister of confessions under the Kerensky government, A. Kartashev, condemned the political activity of the Sobor as both unwise and in the extreme injurious.[11] Prince Gregory Trubetskoy, who had fought in the White Guard armies, publicly declared that, in all his dealings with the Patriarch, the latter always resolutely refused to commit himself in any way to the White Guard position, and that he opposed the Karlovtsi Sobor." [12] [13]

After his death, a statement purporting to have been written by the Patriarch with the intention of issuing it on his return to the Donskoy Monastery the following day was issued. The sudden death prevented this. This statement was released to the press by close associates of the Patriarch with the following letter:

The Editorial Office of *Izvestiya.*

Citizen Editor:

We beg that you do not refuse space in your paper *Izvestiya* to the enclosed proclamation of Patriarch Tikhon, signed by him on April 7, 1925.

Peter, Metropolitan Krutitsky,
Tikhon, Metropolitan Uralsky,

April 14, 1925.[14]

[10] *Ibid.,* p. 191.

[11] *"Politics and the Church,"* in *Russian Thought,* Jan.-Feb., 1922 (in Russian).

[12] *The Black Book,* pp. 161-62.

[13] Spinka, *op. cit.,* pp. 166-69.

[14] Quoted from the *Messenger of the Holy Synod,* No. 3, 1925, p. 5. (Spinka, *op. cit.,* p. 290.)

In the body of this referring to the activities of the Karlowitz Synod the Patriarch ruled:

"At the same time, we must mention with a deep sorrow that certain sons of Russia, and even hierarchs and priests, have left the fatherland for various reasons, and already have busied themselves in activities to which they have not been called and which, in any case, are injurious to our Church. Making use of our name and our ecclesiastical authority, they have carried on harmful and counter-revolutionary activity. We positively declare that we have no connection with them, as our enemies affirm; they are strangers to us, and we condemn their harmful activity. They have freedom of conviction, but they use our name and the name of the holy Church in an unauthorized fashion and against the canons of our Church, feigning to be solicitous about its good. The so-called Sobor of Karlovtsi brought no blessing to the Church or the nation, and we again confirm positively that any such further attempt will call forth on our part extreme measures, even to the forbidding of the ministry and trial by the tribunal of the Sobor. In order to avoid such severe penalties, we call upon all hierarchs and priests abroad to cease their political activity in connection with the enemies of our nation, and to have the manliness to return to the fatherland and to speak the truth about themselves and the Church of God." [15]

The Status of the Karlowitz Synod has also been the subject of a special ukase of the present *locum tenens* Metropolitan Sergius. This reads as follows:

To His Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius,
The Administrator of the Russian Church in Western Europe.

The *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See and the temporary Holy Patriarchal Synod have read the reports of the administrator of the West-European Orthodox Churches, His Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius, these reports having been sent to the representative of the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See, the first on September 12, 1927 (No. 1824), and the second on October 16/29, 1927 (No. 2228). The first report deals with the discord which has taken place between Metropolitan Eulogius and the Synod of Archbishops in Karlowitz; the second speaks of the interdiction laid by the Karlowitz Sobor on Metropolitan Eulogius and on other members of the clergy who are of the same opinion as he. A copy of the epistle of the Constantinople Patriarch declaring this interdiction to be invalid, as well as other documents, are appended

[15] Spinka, *op. cit.*, pp. 287-8.

to this report. A third report with the list of those members of the clergy abroad who were loyal to Metropolitan Eulogius was sent 6/19 April.

(*Nota Bene:* A decree of the Holy Patriarch annulled the High Church Administration of the Churches abroad in April, 1922.)

This decree was corroborated by an Ukase of the Holy Patriarch Tikhon and of the Patriarchal Church Administration, November 10, 1923 (No. 106). May 9th the following resolution was passed (No. 104):

1. Their Eminences Metropolitan Eulogius, Administrator of the West European Churches, former Archbishop of Bielostock, Vladimir, former Bishop of Bielsk Sergii, and former Bishop of Sebastopol, Benjamin, who have signed the obligation we demanded of them, are to be considered as still belonging to the administrative canonical jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate.

2. His Eminence Metropolitan Eulogius is to remain at the head of the administration of the Russian Churches in Western Europe as heretofore, until such time as we shall have looked through the project of administration which he has presented to us.

3. The Sobor of Archbishops and the Synod of Karlowitz are nothing but the continuation of the former temporary Higher Church Administration of the Russian Churches abroad, and must therefore be considered dissolved, according to the decrees of the Holy Patriarch Tikhon, and have no canonical authority to administer the affairs of the Russian Orthodox Church abroad. Thereby the whole system of Church administration of the Karlowitz group of Russian bishops, which is opposed to the canonical administration of the Russian Churches in Western Europe, headed by Metropolitan Eulogius, is dissolved.

4. All the resolutions of the Karlowitz Sobor and Synod regarding the administration of the Russian Churches abroad, the establishment of new dioceses, the nomination or the dismission of bishops, are to be considered as having no canonical authority.

Nota Bene: In particular.

5. The interdiction laid on Metropolitan Eulogius and on other bishops and members of the clergy are to be considered unlawful, and those who have not submitted to them are not to have any blame laid upon them.

6. The attempt made by the Karlowitz group of Russian bishops to establish in Western Europe their own special hierarchy, parallel to the canonically lawful Orthodox Russian hierarchy and clergy, is to be considered as a self-willed action most dangerous for the order and even for the unity of the Russian Orthodox Church not only abroad, but even within the precincts of the U. S. S. R. This action was undertaken by

the group of bishops after they had laid an interdiction on Metropolitan Eulogius. Particularly harmful is the declaration made known in the circular epistle of the Karlowitz Sobor (August 27 and September 9, 1927) that the Karlowitz group, though remaining a part of the Russian Orthodox Church, are nevertheless its representatives abroad. They accept the spiritual leadership of the Patriarchal *locum tenens* and at the same time cut themselves off from all administrative canonical connections with the Moscow Church Authority, and are decided henceforward to administer their affairs independently. This declaration evidently was taken as the program for the activity of certain disloyal members within the precincts of the U. S. S. R. Metropolitan Eulogius has also brought to our knowledge the fact (though perhaps this was not seriously meant) that certain bishops of this group wanted to declare their Sobor and their Synod as the highest Church authority in the whole of the Russian Church, including Moscow. Such actions, according to the Church canons, demand serious condemnation and punishment.

7. But being desirous of using all measures for the preservation of peace and unity within the Church, we have decided to address the bishops of the Karlowitz group, through the mediation of Metropolitan Eulogius, begging him in a spirit of brotherly love to submit to the lawful hierarchy of the Russian Orthodox Church and at a date fixed together with Metropolitan Eulogius, but not later than 1st to 14th of September, to send him a declaration that the Sobor and the Synod, as well as all their subordinate institutions, have ceased their activity, the rights and business thereof to be given over to Metropolitan Eulogius. Or should such a general declaration be deemed unsuitable that they should declare their personal readiness to forsake the jurisdiction of the Sobor and the Synod, as the above named institutions are not legal; also that they submit to the canonically established authority of Metropolitan Eulogius, as the administrator of the West European Churches. If Metropolitan Eulogius should not receive such an answer, it will be considered as a refusal to submit to the present demand.

7. When such an answer has been received by Metropolitan Eulogius, the bishops and other clergy of the Karlowitz group will be considered in the following groupings:

a. Those who will accept the present demand and will declare themselves loyal to the Soviet authority will be considered as still belonging to the jurisdiction of the Moscow Patriarchate;

b. Those who will declare themselves ready to submit to the present demand regarding the abolition of the Karlowitz Synod and Sobor, but who will not declare their loyalty, are to be considered as no more belonging to the administration of the Patriarchate, and Metropolitan

Eulogius is enjoined to dismiss them from the positions which they occupy in the administration of the Patriarchate;

c. Those who refuse to submit to the present demand, or who will leave it unanswered at the date fixed—independently of the fact that they will or will not declare their loyalty to the Soviet authority—are to be given over to the tribunal of a council, as not having submitted to the lawful Church hierarchy; as men who promote schism. Interdiction may be laid on such members as are particularly guilty and stubborn, their not being allowed to perform Divine service until they repent or until final judgment be pronounced.

The present Ukase is sent to Your Eminence to make known to those whom it may concern.

June 8, 1928.

Vice-*Locum Tenens* of the Patriarchal See,
SERGII, Metropolitan of Nijny
Administrator of the Affairs of the Holy Patriarchal Synod,
ARCHMONK PITIRIM.[16]

Notwithstanding the counter-revolutionary activities and absurd claims of the Karlowitz Synod, it has been viewed by the Russian *Émigrés* both clergy and people as a body well fitted through life experience and abundant leisure for research and study to act as a Council of advice. In this capacity it issued, soon after the intrusion of John Kedrovsky into the American Church, the letter addressed to the author, quoted in Part III, Chapter V, inclosing also under its seal a copy of a letter addressed to the Supreme Court of the State of New York, quoted in the preceding chapter.

Later, confusion arose in the American Church over the consecration of one Adam Philippovsky in an irregular manner and without the consent of the American Prelate. The Metropolitan Platon appealed to the Karlowitz Synod, as a competent authority, for advice, which was freely given.

Later, when the Synod found itself unable to enforce its extreme demands, it made recognition of its authority by the prelates to whom the Patriarch had assigned Europe and North America, a *sine qua non* of any friendly overtures.

---

[16] *Poslednya Novosty,* No. 2655, Paris, June 29, 1928.

When this was not given the Synod refused even to give aid in supporting its former contention that the appointment of Kedrovsky was uncanonical; and even claimed the right of appointment of Bishops for America.

Following this, Bishop Anthony was sent to America to dispute the claims of the Metropolitan Platon. The Metropolitan late in 1927 in hope of solving the difficulties went to Karlowitz to attend a Sobor or Convention that had been convoked. The claims of the Synod were so astounding that both Metropolitan Eulogius and Metropolitan Platon withdrew. Before the Metropolitan returned to America the Synod reversed its decision on the validity of the consecration of Bishop Adam Philipowsky, and sent him to America with jurisdiction over the Ukrainian parishes.

Stirred by these continuous acts of intrusion, the prelates remaining in America assembled in Convention in Pittsburgh August 21, 1926, and drew up the following statement and resolutions:

A letter from His Eminence, Metropolitan Anthony, formerly of Kieff, but now a refugee resident in Serbia, under date of 17/30 July, 1926, enclosing copies of protocols No. 4 of 14/27 June and No. 11 of June 18/July 1, 1926, of the meeting of Russian Bishops assembled in Sremsky, Karlowitz, and asking us to present certain declarations of our submission and obedience to these Bishops sojourning as visitors in Serbia under their self-assumed collective title of "Synod and Council of Russian Bishops Outside Russia," was received by His Eminence, Aftimios, Archbishop of Brooklyn and Acting Head of the American Archdiocese of the Russian Orthodox Church, on August 27, 1926, and also transmitted to the other bishops in America.

We have noted an article in the *New Times (Novoye Vremia)* under date of August 3-4, 1926, signed by Metropolitan Anthony, defending and supporting the action and claims of the refugee bishops in Serbia as regards the Church in America and the position of Metropolitan Platon and seeking to explain away the obviously uncanonical and important position of these bishops. The open publication of this article, and the numerous consequent newspaper articles and general discussion and turmoil to which the circulation gave rise in our dioceses, and the unrest and disturbance it causes among our lay people, remove the reso-

lutions and demands of these bishops at Sremsky Karlowitz from the sphere of a calm and orderly discussion among bishops as to the proper government of the Church. By their own procedure these bishops make the proposals in their protocols a direct and open attack upon our diocese, creating dissension and unrest among our clergy and lay people, and giving weapons and assistance to the open and notorious enemies of our Church in America.

We are surprised and shocked at the most unwise and unprecedented presumption exhibited in Paragraphs 5 and 6 of their protocol Number 11 (June 18/July 1, 1926): (1) In that they demand from the Vicar Bishops of the Metropolitan Platon a statement declaring themselves and their dioceses under obedience to the administrative and executive authority of the so-called Council and Synod of Bishops Outside Russia; and (2) in that they declare their intent, in case such a declaration of obedience is not received by their so-called Synod within four months, to send to America the Archbishop Anastassios with authority to take temporary charge of the government of the North American Archdiocese. Such assumption of authority and position can appear to have some validity only if one deliberately refuses to consider the facts which nullify such claims on their part.

Metropolitan Anthony claims in his article in the *Novoye Vremia* that the acts of the Synod of Bishops which met in South Russia in the year 1919 under the presidency of Metropolitan Platon were confirmed by the late Patriarch Tikhon and, by inference, that this confirmation of their acts constituted recognition or Patriarchal confirmation of that Synod to rule the Church in South Russia. Granted that a particular set of acts of that Synod of Bishops in South Russia, then in their sees regularly and canonically, was given Patriarchal confirmation, there is, nevertheless, nothing to show that the Synod itself as a governing body was given any permanent Patriarchal authority. It must be noted also that the meeting of that Synod was a meeting of bishops then governing regular and contiguous dioceses and that its acts concerned only those dioceses whose bishops were in the Synod. If those bishops as a Synod had any Patriarchal authority it could have been only for the regular South Russian dioceses they were governing at the time such Patriarchal authority was granted and for no other dioceses or affairs.

But the Metropolitan Anthony, assuming that the bishops in the Synod of South Russia of 1919 did receive some permanent Patriarchal validation as a governing body, claims that these bishops retained and carried with them such Patriarchal authority when, in time of persecution, they abandoned their churches and flocks to the enemy and fled to Serbia. Had they any governing authority they most certainly forfeit it

when they deserted the dioceses and districts of Russia for which such authority may have been given. But even this obviously unfounded claim to continue as a Synod of South Russia is not sufficient for Metropolitan Anthony and his refugee bishops. He and they must then claim that assumed authority not only was retained in its full validity and force by bishops deserting their dioceses, but also that it was automatically extended to encompass the whole of the Russian Church and more particularly those old established outlying missions and dioceses outside Russia, such as China, Japan, Alaska, and North America.

However, a final and effective answer to this preposterous claim is the act of the late Patriarch Tikhon himself. When the bishops formerly of South Russian dioceses had assembled themselves under the leadership of Metropolitan Anthony in Serbia and had begun to issue orders, resolutions, and appeals, as though their self-styled Synod were really the government of the Russian Orthodox Church, Patriarch Tikhon issued an official mandatory ukase of the Patriarchate dissolving their so-called Synod and suspending all activity of these run-away bishops outside their regular dioceses and their own diocesan affairs. That ukase says: "After the appointment of Metropolitan Evlogi to take charge of the Church in Western Europe, there remains no sphere for the activities of the administration" or Synod, so-called, of Bishops Outside Russia. Had the Metropolitan Antony and the other refugee bishops gone out from their dioceses in Russia because of a division or dissension in their own flocks, or because they were rejected by rebellious clergy or Church membership, or for other valid ecclesiastical causes (as did those exiled and temporarily deprived bishops in the history of the Church to whom Metropolitan Antony refers as precedents), there would be reasonable excuse for their present position as refugees and for a claim that they retain in exile the authority over their former dioceses which they exercised when in South Russia. Had these refugee bishops, regardless of the reason for their exile, received, either collectively or individually, after their desertion of their dioceses in Russia, either a Patriarchal mandate directing them, or an official canonical call from diocesan authority or district Synod inviting them to administer any dioceses, districts, Church affairs, or authority outside Russia, there would be reasonable grounds for them to claim some power and authority in the Church outside Russia. But the refugee bishops in the so-called Synod and Council at Sremsky Karlowitz deserted their dioceses and faithful and loyal clergy and people in Russia because of personal danger to themselves from an external and un-Christian enemy persecuting the Church of which they were the shepherds and guardians. After they left their own dioceses they not only did not receive any Patriarchal mandate or any call from diocesan or district

Synods to other positions in or over the Church, or any of its affairs or dioceses, but they were actually inhibited by Patriarchal decree from the exercise of any authority or administration in the Church outside their own Russian dioceses. In every age it has been recognized by the Sacred Canons and by the conscience of the Church and faithful that a bishop who deserts his flock in time of persecution is thereby, *ipso facto,* deprived of his office and all authority and may acquire canonical position and authority again only by Patriarchal or Synodical decree, or by a new call to other administration by diocesan authority or district Synod. Under this canonical deprivation and Patriarchal inhibition are all the refugee bishops who, neglecting their abandoned dioceses in Russia, sit under the presidency of the Metropolitan Antony, formerly of Kief.

The late Patriarch Tikhon issued a ukase permitting and directing each diocese, when unable to have regular communication and supervision from the proper higher Church authority, to conduct its own affairs independently and to renew its own life and order and to be in all respects sufficient unto itself and its own needs until such time as it should be possible to resume regular and normal relations with the proper Patriarchal authority. The same ukase directed that where several contiguous dioceses were cut off from relations with the proper Patriarchal authority, they might organize, for their general interests and for the temporary higher authority of the district which they comprise, a Synod of the bishops of that district under the presidency of the eldest bishop in the district. It was also permitted by ukase of the late Patriarch Tikhon that in the event of the disability or confinement of the Patriarch, the eldest available bishop should organize some form of temporary supreme government by Synod of the other available bishops.

Obviously these orders of the late Patriarch referred only to the government of dioceses by their regular resident diocesan bishops, to the higher government of groups of contiguous dioceses, having common interests, by Synod of the regular resident diocesan bishops of the dioceses concerned, and to the emergency supplying of direction for the office of the Patriarchate in Moscow. We hold that these utterances by the late Patriarch do permit bishops, actually and regularly governing dioceses that lie outside Russia, to associate themselves voluntarily into Synods to provide in emergency for the collective needs of the dioceses which they individually represent and govern as canonical diocesans. Yet Metropolitan Anthony so twists and distorts the meaning of these ukases as to try to use them as a foundation for a claim to authority for himself and a group of refugee bishops without dioceses to organize a so-called Synod presuming to govern the entire Russian Church in so far as they are able to gain access to its dioceses without personal danger to themselves. A

sufficient reply to this distortion of the plain meaning and intent of Patriarchal ukases is the fact, admitted and recognized by the self-styled Council and Synod of Bishops Outside Russia, that the Patriarch Tikhon by official and valid ukase directed Metropolitan Evlogius to undertake supreme administration of Russian churches in Western Europe and Metropolitan Platon to exercise supreme authority over the Russian Church in North America.

In spite of all this, disregarding the mandatory inhibition laid upon all the refugee bishops in the ukase of the Patriarch Tikhon dissolving the first so-called Synod organized by Russian bishops in Serbia, the refugee bishops under the leadership of Metropolitan Antony organized new bodies which they call the Council and Synod of Russian Bishops Outside Russia. Of this organization the bishops holding the old-established outlying dioceses and missions outside Russia, such as China, Japan, Alaska, and the American dioceses, are not, according to our understanding, members. It will be recalled that this organization begged Metropolitan Platon to become a member of its so-called Synod over a year ago and that the Metropolitan Platon required as a condition of acceptance that the Patriarchal authority should first give Patriarchal blessing to the refugee organization and the proper mandate permitting his membership therein. Notwithstanding the fact that this organization, created and controlled by refugee bishops and inhibited by Patriarchal ukase, has formally recognized and admitted by validity of the supreme administrative authority vested by the Patriarchal ukase in Metropolitan Evlogius for Europe and in Metropolitan Platon for America, they still have not ceased nor hesitated to cause trouble, dissension, and unrest by open and secret interference in the affairs of the Church in the North American dioceses. For example: A certain Bishop Antony, presumably sent to America by the refugee bishops in Serbia, has twice come to these dioceses, and is still here causing uncertainty and dissension among our people and giving aid and comfort to the enemies of our Church. The recognition by the so-called Synod of the refugee bishops in Serbia of the uncanonical claimant Adam Phillipovsky has caused untold trouble and still separates some few parishes from the proper canonical administration of the Church of America. The aid and supporting recognition given to other intruding vagrant bishops and clergy in America, and the persistence to which their pronouncements, claims, and assumptions of authority give rise, are most efficient weapons in the hands of our common enemy, and further the division and the destruction of the Church in North America.

Never at any time has this organization of bishops at Sremsky Karlowitz, by any word or act, aided, supported, or benefitted the interests

of the Church in North America. Their every word and gesture with regard to the Church here has furthered the destruction of peace and order, and now, when, by witnessing to the invalidity of the pseudo-sobor of Moscow of 1923, and by testifying to the rights and authority of the Metropolitan Platon as against the representative of that pseudo-sobor, John Kedrovsky, they might in a small way have assisted to secure the reëstablishment of civil legal recognition of the true rather than of the spurious Russian Church in America, they refuse. They have been asked and have refused to sign a document of legal testimony to facts prepared for use in the courts in our legal battle to defend and preserve the Church in America from the Soviet Russian Synod or Living Church. Instead of testifying in a legal way to what they always did and still admit and recognize, these bishops now demand the submission of the North American archdioceses and bishops to their so-called Synod and its uncanonical claims to authority.

Not only do these self-deprived bishops without sees refuse to testify to commonly accepted and hitherto formally admitted and recognized facts in order to aid the North American archdiocese in its fight to preserve the Church, but they threaten, in case this archdiocese does not submit to their unfounded claims, to send one of their number to America to begin a new fight; and still further to aid the destruction which we in America have struggled to avert. No more diabolic scheme to destroy the Church in America could be devised by the bitterest enemies of Christ and His Church than this persistent scandal and conflict within the Church. We have scandal and fighting enough from those who are our open enemies. For the sake of the welfare and dignity of the Church, and for the love we all bear to Christ and duty we owe to His Church, may we not be spared the destructive interference of those we call our brothers, but who are unable or unwilling to assist us? They are unable to build the Church in America, will they not please cease tearing it down and breaking it in pieces?

The position of the bishops holding their regular sees in the North American archdiocese has not changed since before the Russian revolution. We have not deserted our dioceses. We have stood through all the difficulties and against all the interference and troubles brought upon us from abroad. We still stand upholding and guarding our churches and the flocks committed to our care. We are convinced that not only in accordance with the ukase of the late Patriarch Tikhon, but also by virtue of the Sacred Canons and the universal custom of the Historic Apostolic Catholic Church it is our right and sacred duty, as bishops sovereign in our dioceses, but unable to receive canonical Patriarchal supervision or direction, to preserve inviolate the charges left under our

care; and not to submit them or ourselves to any presumptuous, unauthorized, self-constituted persons or bodies who pose as substitutes for the rightful Patriarchal authority, now unfortunately unable to exercise the jurisdiction over us inherent in the Patriarchate in Moscow and All Russia. We hold ourselves and our dioceses to be rightfully and canonically subject to the canonical and ecclesiastically regular and lawful authority of the Patriarchate of Moscow and All Russia, by whomsoever rightfully, canonically, freely, and effectually administered, but to no other persons, bodies, or authorities.

Under the present necessarily irregular, canonically inadequate, and uncertain status of the possession and administration of Patriarchal authority in the Patriarchate in Moscow and All Russia, pending the restoration of a regular canonical, certain, and freely effectual Patriarchal administration, we hold that each bishop must administer his rightful diocese independently, or in conjunction with a local Synod of bishops rightfully and canonically administering regular dioceses in the same district. At the same time all bishops and local Synod of bishops for the dioceses in a district must hold and recognize their authority, and all acts that canonically require ratification by Patriarchal authority, pending and dependent on subsequent reviewal and approval by the valid and canonical Patriarchal authority of Moscow when such authority shall be certain and recognized, and free and able to act in a canonically regular manner.

But this right and duty to independently administer regular dioceses, and to organize synods for the higher administration of local groups of dioceses, pertains only to the bishops rightfully possessing such dioceses, and not to refugee bishops who have deserted their own regular dioceses, and have neither Patriarchal appointment, nor diocesan call, to other dioceses or administration. Nor can such refugee bishops, by the organization of themselves into so-called synods or councils, acquire or create for themselves individually or collectively any right or authority to administer, direct, or conduct any churches, dioceses, districts, or affairs of the Church, no matter how great may be the number of refugee bishops who have thus deserted their own dioceses and attempt illegally to seize authority over others.

As regard His Eminence, Metropolitan Platon of Cherson and Odessa, who was forcibly removed from his diocese and subsequently came to America as a refugee, it must be recognized that as a refugee he never attempted to interfere in the affairs of any diocese, but held himself merely as a poor refugee deprived of his own diocese, and therefore without any right or authority in any other. Indeed, when the Metropolitan Platon was here in America as a refugee, the Archbishop

Alexander with the Vicar Bishops of the North American archdiocese met in a regular session of the Synod of the archdiocese and formally and officially asked the Metropolitan Platon to accept supreme administration of the Church in North America. Metropolitan Platon refused. The reply of Metropolitan Platon to all the many official and unofficial urgings that he exercise the administrative authority over the Church in America was always that he was Metropolitan of Cherson and Odessa, only and that being deprived of that diocese he was only a refugee outside it with no power or authority and could take no part in the affairs of any diocese unless directed to do so by Patriarchal authority.

Finally a Patriarchal ukase of the late Patriarch Tikhon relieved Metropolitan Platon from his obligations to the diocese of Cherson and Odessa and appointed him to take charge of the Church in North America. It was in obedience to this ukase that the Metropolitan Platon accepted the insistent call of the bishops and clergy of the North American archdiocese. The genuineness, validity, and authority of this Patriarchal appointment has been recognized and accepted by the bishops in North America, by two conventions of the clergy and laity of the Church in North America. By all the Russian bishops outside Russia, and by Orthodox Church authorities other than the Russian. Neither in America nor abroad is there any denial in the Orthodox Church that the Metropolitan Platon has the double authority of a valid Patriarchal ukase from the Patriarch of Moscow and All Russia and of a repeatedly confirmed call by the North American archdiocese through its bishops and general conventions to take and administer the supreme authority over the Church in North America.

Nor has the Metropolitan Platon, or the Church, or the Bishops of North American Dioceses, surrendered or subjected that supreme authority or its exercise to any other person, body, or authority save only to the proper Patriarchal authority of Moscow. The claim of Metropolitan Antony that Metropolitan Platon, by asking the refugee Bishops in Serbia to express their opinion as to the claims of the uncanonical disturber Adam Phillipovsky, and by asking them to testify for the American courts regarding the status of the pseudo-sobor of Moscow of 1923 and regarding the position of the Metropolitan Platon as against the Living Church agent John Kedrovsky, had recognized or submitted to any authority superior to his own in North America, is unfounded and not supported by fact. In the case of Adam Phillipovsky the Metropolitan Platon merely asked as a matter of friendly courtesy an expression of opinion in a case in which it might have been charged that his own judgment was biased or prejudiced. In the same manner we might equally well have asked the judgment of Greek, Syrians, or any other Orthodox

bishops. In the matter of the testimony regarding the Moscow pseudo-sobor of 1923 and the status of the Metropolitan Platon in America, requested for use in American civil courts, we actually are asking similar testimony from the Patriarch of Constantinople and from other Orthodox prelates and authorities. We do not expect the Patriarch of Constantinople or the Synod of Greece to demand our submission to their authority or to claim that the fact of our request for their witness indicates that we in any way consider ourselves subject to their jurisdiction. In neither of these instances nor at any other time has the Metropolitan Platon, or any of the Bishops in America, given any ground for the Metropolitan Antony or any one else to assume that any higher authority or administration other than that of the Patriarchate of Moscow is either recognized or required by the bishops of the American dioceses under the supreme administration of His Eminence Metropolitan Platon.

Therefore, be it resolved: That in view of the above facts, and standing firmly in their canonical rights and sacred duty, the five canonical bishops rightfully administering their regular dioceses in North America, make and publish the following reply to the uncanonical, illegal, and unprecedented demands of the refugee bishops and their associates assembled in Serbia under the leadership of Metropolitan Anthony, formerly of Kief:

1. We declare that rightfully, of its own officially expressed will, and in full accordance with the Sacred Canons, and by specific Patriarchal authority of the ukase of the late Patriarch Tikhon of Moscow and All Russia, the Church in North America with its bishops is under the supreme administrative authority of His Eminence Metropolitan Platon, formerly of Cherson and Odessa, but now of North America and Canada.

2. We declare that rightfully, of its own officially expressed will, and in full accordance with the Sacred Canons, and by the authority and direction of Patriarchal ukase of the late Patriarch Tikhon, pending the establishment and general recognition of certain, canonical, valid, freely and effectually acting administration of the Patriarchal Authority of Moscow and All Russia, the Church in North America, with its bishops in their regular dioceses, under the supreme administration of Metropolitan Platon, is temporarily independent and autonomous subject to the subsequent review and ratification of its acts and status by such valid, recognized, certain, canonical, free, and effectual administration of the Patriarchal Authority of Moscow and All Russia.

3. We declare that pending and subject to further or more certain information as to the canonical status of the administration of the Patriarchal Authority in Russia, the Church in North America recognizes and accepts His Eminence, the Metropolitan Peter, as Guardian of the

Patriarchal Throne of Moscow and All Russia, and will mention his name and no other as Supreme Head of the Church, together with the names of the proper supreme civil authorities in America in the divine services of the Church.

4. We declare that the so-called Council and Synod of Bishops Outside Russia, meeting at Sremsky Karlowitz, Serbia, has neither authority, right, or canonical standing, collectively or as individual bishops, to interfere in any diocese or district not their own, or to administer or exercise any ecclesiastical power or function not pertaining to the dioceses they represent and govern.

5. We denounce and condemn as uncanonical, illegal, anarchistic, dangerous and destructive to the Church, the activities and assumptions of authority and the unauthorized pronouncements and public utterances on diocesan affairs by any and all refugee bishops without dioceses of their own either as individual bishops or collectively under the self-assumed name of councils or synods.

6. We denounce and condemn as a contemner of the Sacred Canons, a disturber of peace and order, and an enemy of the welfare of the Church of the Christ, any person or persons who, without specific Patriarchal direction, may dare to come or presume to send others, to interfere in or lay their hands upon any regular diocese or the affairs of any bishop in the administration of his diocese.

7. We declare our firm determination individually as bishops of regular American dioceses and collectively as the Synod of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, to maintain and to preserve the allegiance of the Church in America to the proper Patriarchal authority as described above, and to that only, pending the ability of such authority freely and effectually to review and ratify our acts and position. And we declare our steadfast resolution to defend our dioceses and the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America from all encroachments or interferences on the part of those within or without the Church who do not act in accordance with this resolution and the Sacred Canons and proper Patriarchal authority.

8. We appeal most earnestly, in the name of the peace, unity, honor, and welfare of the Holy Church of Christ, to all bishops, to the rulers of the Orthodox Churches, to the faithful of the Church in America, and to all friends of the Church of Christ, to support us in this determination to defend and promote the peace, honor, and welfare of the Holy Eastern Orthodox Catholic and Apostolic Church in North America, and to prevent those who cannot build from placing their hands to destroy the Church of Christ.

Most sincerely and faithfully submitted in the Name and for the Sake of Christ and His Church.

Signed: Archbishop Aftimios
Theophilos, Bishop of Chicago
Arseny, Bishop of Winnipeg, B. T.

Signed: Rev. Leonid J. Turkevich,
Secretary of the Synod.

As far as the writer knows, the only reply has been the appointment of Bishop Appolinarius, formerly living in California as a Vicar Bishop of Metropolitan Platon, as Prelate in charge of the Russian Church in North America.

The followers of Appolinarius are announcing that the decree of the State of New York decided that Metropolitan Platon is not valid and canonical Archbishop of America because he did not get his appointment from the Karlowitz Synod. A reference to the decision of the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court as found in Part VI, Chapter I, will show the absurdity of this claim. The Karlowitz Synod is not even mentioned.

PART VII

The Russian Church in 1928

CHAPTER I. Religious Forces in 1928

CHAPTER II. Intrigue and Aggression in 1928

CHAPTER III. Vitality of Religion in 1928

CHAPTER IV. Inner Life of the Church in 1928

CHAPTER I

Religious Forces in 1928

THE world has become so largely case-hardened as far as Russia is concerned that we give little heed to the present difficulties of the oppressed Church. The writer takes great pleasure in reading and re-reading Dr. Matthew Spinka's *The Church and the Russian Revolution* based upon manuscripts collected and personal interviews in 1926. His sympathies are manifestly with the reforming group. Nevertheless, as has been said before, he has presented his documentary facts so impartially that he is often driven to conclusions which seem to controvert his convictions. For this reason it has seemed fairer to quote largely from him, rather than from other documents and translations made by those equally sympathetic with the other side. This is particularly so in respect to statistics, which we quote in full notwithstanding fuller information at hand.

"It would be interesting," says Dr. Spinka, "to cast a glance at the general ecclesiastical situation in Russia as reflected in the statistics published about the time of the meeting of the Sobor, because in spite of their admitted incompleteness, they yet afford some idea of the then existing conditions. According to the official government statistics, there were in October, 1925, in 48 gubernias (out of the total of 87; the rest failed to report) of Russia, 34,597 congregations in all. Out of these, 28,381, or 82 per cent, belonged to the Russian Orthodox Church; 1,647, or 4.8 per cent, to the Old Ritualists; 639, or 1.8 per cent, to the Evangelicals; 141, or 0.4 per cent, to the Roman Catholics; 267, or 0.8 per cent, to the Lutherans; 673, or 1.9 per cent, to the Baptists; 418, or 1.2 per cent, to the Jews; 1,818, or 5.3 per cent, to the Mohammedans; and 613, or 1.8 per cent, to other unclassified religious bodies.

"It is apparent from these figures that the Orthodox congregations

have an absolute majority of 82 per cent, the rest comprising the remaining 18 per cent. As for the relative density of the religious organizations, 41.6 per cent of the gubernias have an average of 40-50 congregations to each 100,000 inhabitants; but in the scantily settled Kirghiz gubernias there is the minimum of 14 congregations to the same number of inhabitants. In 5 gubernias, among 100,000 people, there exists the low number of congregations ranging from 21 to 30: these are the thinly populated regions of Votskaya Oblast (23), Northern Caucasia (27), the gubernias of Vyatka (30), Novonikolaesk (29), and Altai (29). On the other hand, the greatest number of religious organizations in relation to the same number of inhabitants is found in the gubernias of Yaroslavl (65), Arkhangelsk (68), Orenburg (69), Vladimir (79), and Murmansk (223). The last named, so markedly out of proportion with the rest, is an enormous territory with a total of 17,918 inhabitants, and the proportional number may be misleading, for in reality there exist only 40 congregations; but when the index is taken by using 100,000 inhabitants as a unit of comparison, it yields the above given figure.

"The overwhelming majority of the religious organizations (95.6 per cent) possess a regular place of worship. Of the Russian Orthodox, 99 per cent conduct their worship in church buildings; among the Mohammedans, 97.7 per cent are thus provided for; among the Catholics, 92 per cent; among the Lutherans, 90 per cent; among the Jews, 81.2 per cent; of the Evangelicals, 40 per cent, for many of them meet in private homes; the Baptists have the lowest number, 34.4 per cent.

"Another interesting item, effectively dealing with the many exaggerated reports current abroad concerning the high percentage of former church buildings converted to other—often unworthy—uses, is an itemized statement regarding the total number of church buildings converted to other uses, and the purpose to which they were devoted: there were 1,003 Orthodox churches thus confiscated, of which 114 were converted into schools, 195 into club rooms, 280 used for other purposes, 298 were left unused, and 6 demolished because they were condemned as unsafe, while 31 were not reported upon. Of the Mohammedan places of worship, 29 were confiscated, and of this number 2 were converted into club rooms and 27 remained unused. Of the places of worship belonging to the Old-Ritualists, 27 were appropriated, of which 5 were converted into schools, 1 into another educational institution, 10 were used for industrial or residential purposes, and 11 remained vacant. Of all the rest of the communions, 29 places of worship were confiscated, of which number 3 were turned into club rooms, another 3 were devoted to other educational purposes, 14 to industrial and residential purposes, and 9

remained unoccupied. It ought to be remarked, however, that these reports cover only twenty-nine gubernias, which is only one-third of the total; so that the information thus offered is seriously defective because of its incompleteness, and the same, to a less degree, applies to the entire report. Nevertheless, that is the only information of the kind available, and in spite of its admitted defects, affords a certain rough basis for estimating the general conditions.

"Although the patriarchal party published no statistics regarding its strength, some notion of the relative numbers of the two factions of the Orthodox group may be gathered from the official statistics of the synodical party. The itemized figures published in *The Messenger* report that on October 1, 1925, that branch of the Orthodox Church was divided into four autonomous organizations: the Georgian Church, the Ukrainian Church, the White Russian Church, and the Russian Church under the leadership of the Holy Synod. The Georgian Church had pronounced its autonomy in 1917, having ignored the existing authorities; since then it is not in canonical relations with the Russian Church. The Ukrainian Church had pronounced itself autocephalous on May 8/21, 1925, and this status had been confirmed by the third Local Sobor of the Orthodox Churches in the U. S. S. R. in October, 1925. The Ukrainian Church is governed by an Ukrainian Sobor and its own Holy Synod. Members of the Ukrainian Church have the right to attend, as delegates, the Local Sobors of the Orthodox Churches in the U. S. S. R., and three representatives of the Ukrainian Holy Synod are members of the All-Russian Holy Synod. The Ukrainian autocephalous Church comprises sixteen eparchies, with thirty-three bishops and 3,000 congregations.

"The White Russian Church has become autonomous since May, 1924; it is governed by a White Russian Sobor and its own Holy Synod; it, likewise, has the right to send delegates to the All-Russian Sobors, and its representatives have a seat in the All-Russian Holy Synod. It comprises four eparchies, with six bishops and 500 parishes.

"Under the direct supervision and control of the Holy Synod of the Russian Orthodox Church are the Churches abroad, in America, in France, in Germany, in Denmark, and in Athens, as well as eighty-seven eparchies within the territory of the U. S. S. R., which are organized into seven metropolitanates: the Siberian, the Far-Eastern, the North Caucasian, the Crimean, the Trans-Caucasian, the Ural, and the Northwestern. The total number (even though based upon incomplete statistics) comprising all the bodies above mentioned is reported as: 108 eparchies, 12,593 parishes, 192 bishops, 16,540 priests. Comparing these figures with those furnished by the government for the entire Orthodox

Church in Russia, the synodical party would comprise about 43 per cent of the total number of parishes; this conclusion, however, is likely to be incorrect, for the statistics of the synodical party are much more complete, and therefore higher, than for the rest of the Church. Hence it would appear that to estimate the synodical strength at one-third of the total would likely be nearer the truth. Even at that the figures, considering the conditions and circumstances, are extremely favorable to that party."

Regarding the status of the Churches, Dr. Spinka states:

"The patriarchal party is not wholly free; its members do not possess the freedom of organization which their opponents enjoy, for they do not have the right to organize themselves into eparchial units as the synodical Church has; moreover, the hierarchs of that party are often hampered in their movements and are never wholly free from the danger of imprisonment. Thus Metropolitan Sergei is not permitted to leave Nizhni Novgorod, as Metropolitan Agathangel had been prevented from coming to Moscow in 1922 when he was summoned by Tikhon to assume the duties of patriarchal substitute. In the summer of 1926, about ten bishops belonging to the patriarchal party were ordered out of Moscow, simply because the authorities were suspicious of them. It is generally known that the official representatives of the patriarchal party regard it as perilous to speak freely with any foreigner for fear that it may arouse the suspicions of the government and lead to unpleasant consequences, and even to forcible measures. I have been repeatedly refused audiences with members of this group, solely because they feared to speak with a foreigner.

"The synodical party, on the other hand, possesses the confidence of the government, and therefore a degree of freedom which disposes it to a loyal acceptance of the new conditions. The representatives of high official rank with whom I have had personal conferences earnestly urged that the new order is conducive to a truer religious liberty than the former order was, which heaped unjust prerogatives and privileges on the Church, but constrained it to do its bidding in every nefarious purpose of its own. This party affirms that there has been no overt persecution of the Church, the various penal measures carried out against it having been called out by the disloyal attitude and conduct of the latter. The leaders further zealously affirm that the synodical party does not differ from the patriarchal on questions of dogma or canons, but only in the interpretations of the Sobor of 1923.

"The synodical party shows a deeper understanding of the necessity of adapting the ancient forms and usages through which Russian

Christianity expressed its piety from time immemorial to the new conditions and demands, and therefore possesses a greater survival power, or even life-energy, than the patriarchal party, which is, perforce, wedded to the traditional usages and dogmas. There is likewise a greater theological elasticity in the synodical group, even though the party officially has not embraced any tenets at variance with Orthodoxy; besides, there is a feeling of freedom regarding the liturgical services, which, in places, are performed without their former traditional rigidity, but are experimented with in the direction of greater freedom and what may be spoken of as Protestantization, using the word in its best sense."

Dr. Spinka devotes considerable space to the sectarians, who do now enjoy religious liberty. They claim a joint membership of about fifteen million. They must enter into any study of the Russian Church because:

"The rate at which the sectarians grow is alarming to the Orthodox Church, for their growth, as a matter of fact, is quite remarkable. Some idea of the rate of increase may be gained from the statistics for the gubernia of Kiev, in the year 1923: the Baptists increased from eleven congregations to fifteen, the Spiritual Christians from fifty-nine to one hundred and twenty-eight, the Adventists from one to twenty-four, and the Malevantsi from three to twenty-six.

"Hence it is rather easy to understand why the Communist leaders look with a certain degree of favor upon the sectarians, and why the sectarians, on the other hand, are so solidly supporting the new régime. The Thirteenth Congress of the Russian Communist Party adopted the following resolution:

" 'We must pay the greatest attention to the sectarians, who were generally persecuted under the Tsar, and some of them are very active. By approaching them wisely, we must secure their most energetic and cultured elements for our own task. In view of the large number of the sectarians, this work is of great importance. The problem must be solved in accordance with local conditions.'

"The same favorable opinion was shared by Rykov, Bukharin, Kalinin, and Smidovich, as well as by Lenin. The fact that many sectarians share the communistic ideal with the anti-religiously motivated Communist party, brings them together in attempting to work for that element of their aspirations which they possess in common. No wonder that one of these sectarian leaders wrote me enthusiastically: 'I consider the Soviet Government the best régime, particularly because it is striving to realize communism, which is also the ideal of all sectarians-communists.' "

This favorable view seems to be changing, as shown by the following quotation from the *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* Moscow, June 6, 1928, under the caption, "Militant Religion is attacking us:"

". . . The sectarian communities alone (there are twenty-three various tendencies among them) have united about 70,000 members in North Caucasus. . . . The most numerous sects are those of the Baptists, the Evangelicals, and the Seventh Day Adventists. They assemble yearly, coming together for official congresses. They have their local centers, and have connections with foreign communities. The yearly income of the Baptist organization is more than 15,000 roubles; that of the Evangelicals amounts to 18,000; and that of the Adventists to 33,000 roubles. Each one of these sects has dozens of salaried workers, experienced preachers and organizers.

". . . A special work is being carried on among the women and the young people. In one of the communities of the New Israel (in the Sal region), a religious group of young people has existed for about a year. This group published a wall newspaper, organized theatricals, had a choir. Cases have been known when the Comsomoltzy forsook our organization to join the sects. In opposition to the 'Harvest Day,' the sectarians organized their own religious Harvest Festivals. Sometimes they organized lectures with pictures on natural history and history subjects. Their modern slogan is, For Christian Coöperation, and there are others in the same strain.

". . . The growing generation is being submerged by the murky waves of religion. At home the children are educated 'in the fear of God,' and the schools are 'wisely' neutral. The investigations made in several Krasnodar schools (attended mostly by the children of the workingmen) have proved that 40 per cent of the children from 12 to 13 years of age believe in God. In the villages of Tchernomorie, the church and the school can often be found under the same roof, and the children constantly run into church. . . .

"The Comsomoltzy show very little energy on the anti-religious front. Out of the 69,000 Comsomoltzy of the North Caucasus, only 6,000 are members of the Association of the Godless. The anti-Christian campaign was very weak in many centers. The lower professional and even the party organizations speak with indifference about any kind of propaganda of godlessness. In Tagonroge, in leather factory No. 1, the propaganda agent of the Party group expelled the group of godless from the factory.

" 'Get along with you to the club. What are you talking about?

Among the workmen money is being collected for a church in Michaeloff, they say? Well, in how far does this concern me? . . .'

"We are hanging back in an unpardonable manner instead of withstanding the religious attack. This front of our class struggle is quite unprotected. The Comsomol must immediately mobilize all its strength for a widespread, steady, and competent counter-attack."

A realization of the growing power of the religious forces finally dawned upon the government, and drove it to compromise. The supreme act of recognition is found in the revision of the law relating to religious communities published in *Krasnaya Gazeta,* No. 159, Leningrad, June 11, 1928, under the caption,

"THE NEW LAW REGARDING RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES."

"The Sovnarkom (Soviet of People's Commissaries) of the R. S. F. S. R. has adopted a new order for introducing into practice the decree regarding the separation of the Church from the State.

"The property needed for the performance of religious rites is nationalized and given over to the communities without any exaction of payment, so that the communities can make use of it in their services.

"The erection of new houses of prayer is permitted without *any hindrance.*

"The closing of houses of prayer is admitted of *only* in exceptional cases when the *presidium of the executive committee* can present well-grounded reasons for doing so; when serious state or social reasons demand such a measure. The closing of houses of prayer is not permitted when such an action would be prejudicial for the further practice of the cult in the given community.

"If the house of prayer is found to be in a dangerous condition because of its age or because of the excessive number of the congregation, such a house may be closed only after a careful examination of the building by a competent committee. When a house of prayer is being closed, all metal objects of value, all the church bells, the hanging lamps, carpets, etc., must be given over to the State fund; all objects of artistic value to the Central Scientific section (Glavnauka); and all the remaining property, such as ikons, robes, banners to the faithful, to be taken to other houses of prayer.

"Religious processions (processions with banners, *Te Deums*) are permitted to be performed outside the church. It is also permitted that the ikons should be brought to the houses of the faithful and that prayers should be performed in their homes.

"No religious ceremonies are permitted within the precincts of institutions, with the exception of hospitals and prisons, where they can be performed at the request of those who are dying or are seriously ill. Religious communities *are not permitted to organize assemblies for children, for boys and girls, or for women under the pretence of choir singing, of literary evenings, of sewing classes, or of labor groups and clubs.*

"No libraries or reading rooms are permitted to be opened in the building of the prayer house.

"The organs whose duty it is to register the Church members have the right to forbid certain persons being elected as members of the executive committee of the religious community."

CHAPTER II

Intrigue and Aggression in 1928

WHILE the strength of the Church in 1928 is manifest, the dangers that beset it have taken a more dangerous form. There can be no open attack. Faction is still arrayed against faction, but the reaction is fatal to the program of Godlessness. The Patriarchal Church, the Synodical Church, and the various sectarians may, and do, differ each with the other, and in their attitude towards the Government; but each displays a zeal for religion which in some cases tends towards fanaticism. As a whole, all religious forces are loyal to the Government. The existence, however, of positive religion as the controlling influence among the vast majority of the population endangers the basic principles of Bolshevism. This, as we have seen, cannot be met by a frontal attack. Recourse must be had, therefore, to more recondite methods. Hence obstructions, counter attractions, ridicule, and other inducements are the means used for coercing or alluring the masses. The methods in use are numerous. Some of the more recent are given in the following extracts. It is quite natural, under these circumstances, that secularization of churches should be encouraged, and each victory proclaimed from the house-tops. Thus we find the following in *Comsomolskaya Pravda*, No. 110, Moscow, May 13, 1928:

"Monasteries Turned Into Homes for the Workmen

"Kazan, May 8, 1928. The plenum of the city soviet, together with the soviet of the Zaretchie section, have decided to take away from the administration of the clergy all the monasteries of Kazan and of the suburban districts and to transform them into homes for the workmen

who are in great need of suitable quarters, especially those workmen who come up only for the season."

"Proscuroff, May 8, 1928. In the village of Shintzy, the local priest, Grigada, declared officially in the presence of the whole village that he was laying aside holy orders. The village assembly decided to transform the church into a village club."

"The general assembly of all the villagers of Ostapovetz and of the Jewish industrials of the little borough Kuzima has unanimously decided to close the church and the synagogue and to give them over for educational needs."

"Friends in Common Sorrow

"The Jewish workers of Smolensk have demanded that the synagogues should be closed and that the building should be given over to some educational institution. Against the closing of the synagogue a protest was handed in by a small group of Jewish Church members and Nepmen. It is interesting to note that the Smolensk Archbishop, Dmitri, is helping the Jewish Church members. In his sermons from the pulpit he tells the faithful that they ought not to permit the synagogue to be closed. Such aid given by an Orthodox bishop to the Jewish Church members testifies to the fact that the Church members of different religions are joining forces in front of their common foe—the ever growing godlessness."[1]

"A City Without Churches

"Murmansk is one of the few cities in the U. S. S. R. where there *is not a single church.* A group of middle-class shopkeepers and industrials wanted to remedy this 'defect' and began to collect money for the building of a church. But the workmen and the employees of the city passed some very sharp resolutions and protests, demand that the building of a church in the city should be forbidden, and that a stop should be put to the religious propaganda of the Church members."[2]

That this opposition to Church building grows out of necessity coupled with dismay and apprehension is shown by the following:

"Who Builds the Churches?

"The Church members try to prove that the churches are being repaired and sometimes even built without any outward pressure. But this

[1] *Biezbojnik,* No. 23, Moscow, June 3, 1928.

[2] *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* No. 140, Moscow, June 19, 1928.

is not true. The leaders of all such work are the members of the Church council.

"From the midst of whom are these Church soviets or councils chosen? Comrade L. writes to us from Ivanovo-Voznesensk that nearly the whole of the Church council consists of retrograde persons, of monarchists, of those who used to encourage 'pogroms,' of merchants, and all kinds of riff-raff which is anti-sovietique.

"In the council of the Krestovozdvijenskaya Church, out of the seven members, four were members of monarchic organizations during the empire; they had organized 'pogroms' and persecuted the revolutionists. Five members out of seven are merchants. . . . The 'kulak' (well-to-do-peasant) rules the village. At the initiative of the kulaki a new church replaced the one that had been burnt down in Lomoff, in Penza province. In Tchigla, in the province of Voroneje, the priest and the kulaks organized a collection for the repairs of the church. The peasants consented to pay 50 copecks per head.

"In the village Semian of Nijny province, the peasants give twelve pounds of rye per head for the repairs of the church.

"In the village Sheldan of Penza province, the kulaks have unlawfully fixed a certain sum to be given for the repairs of the church. When the poorest peasants proposed to help in building a steam mill and an electrical station instead of repairing the church, the kulaks did not allow them to speak.

"In Baratchikovo (Orloff province), the peasants spent more than 2,000 roubles to buy church bells. The priest of the village Pereyaslavl, in Amour province, is paving the way to have a church built. It is characteristic that in 1927 there was no church community there. In Pereyaslavl the school is crowded, the bridges are half broken down, but the richer peasants are on the side of the priests and bring their money to the church, not to the school.

"But it is not only in the villages that the Church members are working. The priests try to find a way into the factories.

"The case in Sobinka (Vladimir Pr.) has become known all over the U. S. S. R. Here the priests hoodwinked part of the workmen and began building a church. A similar attempt was discovered in April in Viatka. Here the priests found an inlet into the very kernel of the working men's center. The priest, Seliloff, gave 2,500 roubles for the building of the church.

"During the first year the church members collected 3,000 roubles; the members of the village soviet helped in surmounting all official difficulties. Only the Comsomoletz, Zakharoff, was a thorn in their flesh. He assembled 240 young people to protest against the building of a church.

"It is the Church members, the counter-revolutionists, the kulaks, who build the churches. They make use of every mistake to further their aims. In the Soviet apparatus people of a low mentality can also be found; and these unknowingly help the priests.

"The churches are being built by anti-Soviet, by counter-revolutionary elements which are hostile to the working classes. The cock-sure advance of the church builders must meet with a decided rebuff. We must build schools, hospitals, homes, factories, and plants, but not houses of deception—churches.

"The working classes do not need church buildings."[3]

The most open attack at present on the part of the Soviet Government acting through the Comsomol is founded in the efforts put forth to check the observance of the greater Church Festivals, especially Easter and Christmas.

"The Comsomolskoie Christmas in Moscow

"After two years' interruption, this year will again see a 'Comsomol Christmas.' The aim of this festival is to proclaim an anti-religious campaign and to strengthen the battle against the perverted customs of every-day life (especially against alcoholism).

"One month previous to Christmas, reports, discussions, lectures on anti-religious themes and current customs will be held in all the clubs. The Comsomoltzy will prepare for Christmas an exhibition of the struggle against drunkenness.

"A series of socials will be organized. Carnivals and festivals will be arranged on some of the largest skating rinks of Moscow. A chess competition will be organized. The young workmen will be able to go to the theaters for a very low price during these days.[4]

The *Christian East* has collected a number of articles from the Soviet Press, from which we make these selections as showing the extent to which this propaganda is carried.

Comsomolskaya Pravda, Friday, April, 1928. Moscow:

"It is planned to introduce, as an experiment, a new organization of the school year in the cities. Similar to the school period of Western Europe, it will last for 215 to 220 days. The time of the holidays will also be changed. Up to the present time we have kept to the old tradi-

[3] *Biezbojnik,* No. 23, Moscow, June 3, 1928.

[4] *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* No. 265, Moscow, November 20, 1927.

tions; holidays have been given during the Christmas and Easter seasons. But there are no valid reasons for continuing these harmful traditions in the future." [5]

"No festive preparations for Easter are to be made in the family; no new dresses, no extra cooking, no shopping; no special Easter food, such as Easter cakes, hams, painted eggs, etc., are to be allowed. The custom of Easter greetings ('Christ is risen') must be abolished. On the eve of Easter, friendly social gatherings which will begin at 9:30 will be organized in all factories and other places of work. The comsomoltsi have also arranged that on this evening the cinemas should give two additional shows. At midnight cinema pictures, as well as theatricals and radio concerts, will be given on all the big squares." [6] *"Krasnaya Gazeta,* Thursday, 22d March, 1928. Petrograd:

"In view of the approaching Church festival, Easter, the Central Committee of the V. L. K. S. M. has proposed that all the local organizations should increase their anti-religious and anti-Easter activity. However, this campaign must not be carried out in the guise of a 'Comsomol Easter,' because the mass of the workmen and laboring young people might get the false idea that the Comsomol wants to establish a separate kind of Soviet Easter.

"The anti-Easter propaganda must be centered in the club and in the reading-room. It would be well to open just for this time different kinds of competitions: for the best harmonium-player, the best storyteller, the best dancer; to organize chess competitions; competitions of physical culture; archery meetings, etc. In the large cities it would be well to organize, on Easter night, fireworks, etc.

"In the villages the festival of Easter may be contrasted with the festival of the 'First Ploughing.' All local cultured elements (teachers, agricultural agents, doctors, etc.) must take part in the anti-Easter campaign. Out-of-door demonstrations of gramophone anti-religious songs may also be organized." [7]

"ANTI-EASTER, ANTI-RELIGIOUS WORK

"THE AIMS OF THE CAMPAIGN

"The aims of the educational revolution, which have been so clearly set forth by the Fifteenth Party Congress, cannot be carried out without a struggle against religious influences, and without a prolonged period of work for the eradication of religious prejudices and the breaking down of traditions and rites established by the Church (Confession,

---

[5] *The Christian East,* London, Vol. IX, No. 2, p. 61.

[6] *The Christian East,* London, Vol. IX, No. 2, p. 60 *ff.*

[7] *Pravda,* Thursday, 29th March, 1928, Moscow.

Easter salutations, Communion, etc.).Therefore the fundamental aim of the anti-Easter and anti-religious campaign must be the explanation of the aims of the educational revolution, of the necessity of fighting against religion, which acts like a brake hindering the educational progress of the masses and the socialistic up-building of the country.

"Besides this, the contents of our propaganda work must be centered around the following fundamental ideas:

"a. Revealing the counter-revolutionary part played by all religious organizations, both those of the Orthodox Church and of the sects.

"They are all instruments of political influence over the masses, wielded by the remnants of the former dominating classes and by the rich peasants and the Nep Men. These are upheld by the international bourgeoisie (Note the help given by the Baptists, by Rockefeller, etc.).

"b. The working masses of the U. S. S. R. must be made to know the reactionary activity of all religious organizations in capitalistic countries; the aid they give to bourgeois governments in their struggle against the proletarian movement; the calumnies they spread regarding the U. S. S. R.

"At the same time we must inform them of the widespread proletarian godless movement in the capitalistic states; we must form one strong front of the godless in all countries.

"c. New members must be drawn into the Association of the Godless, the organization must be strengthened, and the active participation of the comsomol in this work encouraged. Reports of this work must be read in the comsomol groups.

"In the villages the anti-religious work will begin by an explanation of the true meaning of rites and traditions; it must be explained that the measures adopted by Soviet authorities and by the Party are the result of scientific and technical progress, and that they alone will help the up-building and improvement of agriculture; that religion, the Church and all its rites only hinder this. . . ." [8]

During the earlier part of the Bolshevik movement the sectarians were not only unmolested but encouraged. It was naturally assumed that inasmuch as their ecclesiastical structure was based upon a communistic principle, they would follow the Soviet system in all its details. In recent years the government has discovered that the power of Christ within the Church was too great to allow the acceptance of the program of "Godlessness." Today we find that they are being attacked

[8] *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* Friday, 30th March, 1928, Moscow.

as bitterly and in some cases more bitterly than the Orthodox Church. The following is an example:

Comsomolskaya Pravda, Saturday, 14th April, 1928. Moscow.

"There are seventeen different sects in Siberia.

"The most powerful one is that of the Baptists. They have their own women organizations, boys' and girls' leaders, and propaganda agents.

"It is interesting to note that in the soap factory in Novosibirsk the Baptists were daring enough to lead an open struggle with the workmen-Communists. The engineer and foreman are Baptists. They give precedence to members of their sect and set aside the Communists; they know how to gain influence over the workmen: 'Enter our sect and you will get a better position and better salary.'

"In the village of Bobrovka, in the Tomsk region, the Baptists literally got all the schools into their own hands. They often give sweets to all the school children who can repeat the prayers well.

"The Baptists organize all kinds of socials; harvest festivals, free dinners and talks, during which a band plays. They have 134 choirs with 2,500 choristers. To strengthen their communities, the Baptists have worked out a plan of changing their leaders from place to place. In the Nijnykargaisky region the Baptists drove from place to place to win the peasants. If the village soviet did not give them permission to hold a meeting, they did so privately in the huts of the richer peasants and preached there.

"The Tikhonians in Oiratil have grown exceedingly daring. During the past summer they christened 400 local residents; among this number one was christened by force. In the village of Aul the Tikhonians by force hung little crosses around the necks of the comsomoltsi."[9]

The warrant for fear and cause for aggressive opposition on the part of the Soviet is found in the following quotations, taken at random from *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* No. 86, Moscow, April 11, 1928:

"SECTARIAN PROPAGANDA BY VIOLENCE

" 'THE SON OF MAN' AT WORK

"Two Mobilizations

"The fifty-three Church organizations of the Volodar region are working without rest. One thousand one hundred and thirty Church members are propagandizing in churches, in private houses, by posting up bills with the program of religious services, by festive, solemn Church

[9] *Christian East, ibid.,* p. 64.

services in which archbishops take part, etc. A religious procession with a miracle working ikon is being prepared; a few thousand men will take part in it.

"The sectarians *Anisomoytzy* have chosen the following slogan: 'All the children must belong to the sect of the *Anisimovtzy* or they will have to leave the home.' It is easy to imagine how many tragedies come as the result of such a slogan. The Moscow-Narva Christomol has developed a furious activity. They propagandize against the educational campaign and against the slogans of the comsomol. Up to the present moment the Evangelicals alone have published 200,000 copies of religious literature for a sum of 214,000 roubles. . . ."

"The Remarks Made by A. V. Kareff

"In the Swedish church (Street of Perovsky, No. 3) a well attended social gathering took place a few days ago, organized by the Evangelicals. There were lantern slides. Among the 500 people present, 100 were Evangelicals. An organ and a piano portrayed in good music the 'Passion of Our Lord . . .'

THE FOE STANDS AT THE DOOR

"In the Leningrad province for the 1st of January, 1928, the following groups were registered: 2,150 Orthodox religious groups; 235 groups of other religious denominations; 284 sectarian groups.

"In the cities of the Leningrad province there are 702 prayer buildings; in the villages, 2,652; in Leningrad there are 532 priests. One thousand nine hundred workmen and over 100 students take part in the church committees and in the sectarian soviets. Among the Evangelicals, Baptists, Teetotallers, 20 per cent are workmen, 24 per cent are employees; in the villages 20 per cent are the poorest peasants and 70 per cent are of the middle class peasants. In some of the sects (the Tchourikoff sect) the percentage of workmen is as high as 60 per cent.

"The picture of purely educational institutions in the Leningrad province is very instructive. In the 3,120 village soviets of the province there are only 678 hut-reading rooms; in the Murman district there is only one reading room for eleven village soviets. Thus we have the contrast: 678 reading rooms and 2,652 churches. This gives us no reason for being satisfied.

"The special investigations made in the second-grade schools of Moscow have shown (article by Jaroslavsky in the *Comsomolskaya Pravda*) that among the school children more than 50 per cent believe in God, etc.

"Before the advance of our class foe, before the arrival of a counter-revolution which is but slightly hidden behind the veil of religion, our comsomol must make proof of great care. Its work must be new and in-

teresting for the masses; its scientific, educational, and anti-religious work must be well organized. *The foe is at the door.*

"S. Biezborodoff."

Referring to the former monasteries, we find the following statement in *Comsomolskaya Pravda,* Tuesday, April 10, 1928:

"The Lavra's existence was at an end. All over the country the dictatorship of the proletariat has pronounced judgment against the monasteries.

"The monasteries are no more centers of propaganda preaching; they have been transformed into museums, established to preach against God. Many excursions come to visit them.

"The leader of these excursions, a member of the administration of the museum, Baron von Dervize, is himself a believer. We expressed our astonishment that the museum was not preaching against religion. He replied that it was his business only to preach against monasteries, *i.e.,* against the monastic order of things. But during all our visit the Baron did not once express himself as being against the monastery. The walls of the museum are hung with portraits of emperors and empresses. . . ."

This is the manner in which the Bolsheviks apply these anti-religious demonstrations during the High Festivals of the Church:

The Anti-Easter Carnival in Leningrad

". . . Seven thousand boys and girls of the Comsomol and of the workmen packed cram-full the academic theaters, the circus; thousands of the adult workmen swarmed into the open doors of the cinemas; they took their wives and children with them.

"During this cold, windy night, all the educational institutions of Leningrad waged a fierce battle against century-old traditions, against popular customs, against religious prejudices. Every factory club, every educational house, offered something original, new and interesting, as a contrast to the church bells and the religious processions.

"The 'House of Culture' of the Moscow-Narva region was literally a-bubbling with hearty merriment. In the immense theater hall, music and plays followed each other in succession. On every storey, in all the halls, rooms and corridors, the sound of bands could be heard; the young people were dancing, playing, mischief-making." [10]

[10] *Pravda,* Wednesday, April 18, 1928, Moscow.

In reading these extracts one learns that religious organization in Russia is still passing through the furnace of affliction. Great encouragement is given to those who note the steadfastness of Christian people, and the manner in which many who had strayed from the fold are now turning to the Church for comfort and peace.

CHAPTER III

Vitality of Religion in 1928

EVEN cursory reading of the current publications of Russia will show that the Church is by no means supine after ten years of oppression. Quite the contrary, we find in the Church a vital force which the Bolsheviks note and fear. The dramatic appeal of the Church and apparently much of the servility which grew out of superstition is lacking. In its place we find all classes accepting the Church at its true value, as a "very present help in trouble." Religion has become a personal treasure of the people. The Church is no longer a superimposed institution. The individual seems to consider its welfare as a part of his personal responsibilities. The adjustment of the polity of the Church to a new type of government, the place of the Church in a communistic environment, and essential changes in practices to meet changed social and intellectual conditions, are topics to which all classes give thought.

The Bolsheviks understand this change in the attitude of Churchmen, especially the peasant, and endeavor to explain it away and prepare to resist it. The following quotations from recent publications are illuminating. A sense of weakness in the execution of their program is found in the following article in *Pravda*, No. 106, Moscow, May 9, 1928:

"ANTI-RELIGIOUS PROPAGANDA IS DECREASING

"THE ACTIVITY OF THE RELIGIOUS SOCIETIES IN LENINGRAD IS INCREASING. THE DEVELOPMENT OF SECTARIANISM. THE ANTI-SOVIET PROPAGANDA OF THE SECTARIANS AND ITS RESULT.

"Leningrad, May 8 (Our Correspondent). We have been receiving information from the Leningrad province that the activity of the re-

ligious societies, the number of which has increased to 2,669, has greatly developed. . . . Recently two new churches have been built in the Novgorod district and four more are being built now. . . . Attempts have been made to build churches in other districts as well. . . .

"The increase of sectarians is to be chiefly noticed among the unorganized population—housewives, small industrials, workmen who have come from the villages, etc. The sectarians even find means for sending their members abroad so that they may become qualified preachers.

"In the Lutzk district some of the members of the V. L. C. S. M. (All-Russian Leninist Comsomol) have forsaken this organization, being under the influence of religious propaganda. In one village in the Gdovsk district, six out of twelve Comsomoltzy sing in the church choir. In the village of Kirnovo, of the Novgorod district, the members of the village soviets collected money for the building of a church.

"Anti-soviet propaganda often is counter-revolutionary as well. In the Novgorod district several cases have been registered where the schools were purposely burnt down. In the Leningrad factory (named in honor of Marti) the sectarians conduct religious propaganda quite openly. In the Khalturin factory in Leningrad, booklets inviting the workers to join religious organizations were spread about the factory. It must be admitted that sectarian organizations know when to thank the Soviet Government for having given freedom of conscience and of religion. Cases have been registered in which social leaders have spoken publicly as preachers. The teachers in the Tcherepovetz district have voted for the building of a church. At the initiative of the monks, most of the monasteries have been reopened as 'industrial' communities. This does not prevent them from continuing an anti-socialistic propaganda. It is interesting to note that the pictures of emperors, princes, etc., till now have been hanging on the walls of the monasteries.

"The struggle against sectarianism is all the more difficult because we do not have a sufficient staff of anti-religious leaders, because our funds are low, and because the members of the Party and of the Comsomol do not take a sufficiently active part in the work."

The following quotation from *Biezbojnik*, No. 19, Moscow, May 6, 1928, shows grave reason for fearing the hold of the Church on its members:

"THE ATTACK OF THE CHURCH MEMBERS

"(THE CONDITION OF CONTEMPORARY CHURCH LITERATURE IN THE U. S. S. R.)

"The press is a mighty weapon in the hands of him who wields it. The Church members are well aware of this truth. During the last years

they have paid great attention to their press, and the success they have achieved is considerable.

"The Church members of our times are practical men and know how to find their way. They know how to make use of the poets of former days and of modern poets, too; of the bourgeois men of science of the West and of the contemporary pupils of Marx, whom they like to quote. Here is an article, *Faith and Science,* published in the 15th Number of the *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagoviestnik.* On page 256 we find seven references to scientific literature; two of them are taken from the publications of the Communist University at Home. They are quoted as a proof . . . of the existence of God.

"The contents of the religious journals are composed partly of religious instruction, partly of explanations of the Bible, of Bible songs, etc. Many pages are given up to mutual bickerings. But this is not the most important thing. The main contents of religious journals are devoted to anti-soviet propaganda under the guise of religious teaching. This propaganda is carried on in a very clever manner, not openly. In the May number of the *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagoviestnik* we find a leading article most innocently entitled *Talks On Morality.* The author of the article gives us a description of well-known priestly discussions 'on the great importance of humility and gentleness,' but behind these explanations we seem to hear more contemporary words. The author says, 'When he is poor a moral man does not try to compete with others' (p. 135). What does this word 'compete' mean? Perhaps the author wanted to say, 'Does not try to struggle against the oppressors.' At the end of the paragraph the meaning of these obscure words grows clearer: 'Qualities and virtues sometimes pass unnoticed upon earth, and the opinion of the crowd is often but the echo of passions and material interest.' Now the meaning is clear. The author is speaking of the crowd whose dirty material interests did not allow somebody's virtue to be justly appreciated. Turning over the page, we find out that this crowd will be well punished for its 'pride.' Pride is the worst scourge of humanity. It causes all the discords and troubles of social life, the *competition of classes* and nations, intrigues, hatred, and war. It instills *insane* ideas and fills the earth with *bloodshed and ruin* (the words are underlined by me. M. P.). These words, if translated into simple language, mean that the revolutionary struggle (competition of classes) which had been called forth by the desire of the laboring class to throw off their oppressors ('the outrage against the virtuous because of material interests'), will have no good results and can only lead 'to bloodshed and ruin.' Therefore the workman must shake hands with the bourgeois; the poor peasant with the 'kulak' (tight-fist). Such is the desire of the priests.

"The tactics of the sectarians are somewhat different. These try to bite in a more underhand manner: they publish quite innocent looking remarks, or give the report of a meeting, and add only one or two words. Here, for instance, is the report of an assembly in Leningrad.

" 'Sister Andreeva gave a short report on the work in the family and among the children, because Satan is trying to take away from us what is dearest to our hearts—our children' (No. 9, 1027). Of course, it is clear to all that 'Satan' is meant for the Soviet school and its other organizations.

"In another place in the same journal we find the words: 'We also are living through the times of Golgotha; Christ is being crucified anew; we must learn to see Him and be ever eager to listen to what He orders us to proclaim' (p. 20). It would be difficult to think of a phrase that could act in a more exciting manner on the fanatic sectarian masses. These words remind us of the old retrograde times, when people were incited to destroy.

"Are we doing all we can to make this murky stream of priestly literature sufficiently harmless? Unfortunately, not enough by far. It is true that the circulation of anti-religious literature has reached the figure of 180,000 copies. But can this be looked upon as an achievement? After eleven years of the revolution, we are scarcely ahead of the priests.

"According to the investigations made by the instructors of the V. Z. S. P. S. (Central Trade Union Bureau) in the libraries of the professional associations, we see that anti-religious literature occupies no more than 3 per cent of their space.

"In the reports of the investigations made in the Ukrainian libraries, anti-religious literature is not mentioned at all. Yet the interest in it is very great. In the library of the factory Aviopribor (Moscow) the demand for anti-religious literature occupies second place. All these facts tell us that we must increase the number of anti-religious publications.

"The Church members do all they can to creep in through every crack; first tentatively pushing through a finger, and after that getting the whole hand through. The best repulse of their attack will be to spread anti-religious publications as widely as possible. We need books that will cost from one to five copecks. Leaflets must be given out free. The Troitzko-Serguievskaya Lavra and other monasteries used to publish this kind of leaflets quite cost-free. We also are in want of anti-religious pictures. They must be cheap, amusing, clear, and not uselessly complicated."

Many reports indicate that this natural religious tendency of the Russian people is the greatest thorn in the flesh of

Soviet regime. Em. Jaroslavsky (in *Revolution and Culture,* No. 5, Moscow, 1928) states the danger very fully:

"Let us pass in review different questions: Religion, the Lack of Political Rights for Women, the Oppression and Legal Inequality of Non-Russian Minorities. All these are the problems of a bourgeois-democratic revolution. The trivial-minded leaders of bourgeois democracy discussed them for eight months, but there exists not one country, however progressive, in which these questions have been solved, truly solved, in a bourgeois-democratic manner. We have solved them by the legislation of the October revolution. We are struggling, we have been struggling against religion in the true manner (Lenin, *The Fourth Anniversary of the October Revolution*).

"It is scarcely necessary to prove on the pages of the journal *Revolution and Culture,* that religion is reactionary and hostile to the Revolution. For instance, Orthodoxy, the State religion during the Tsars, has always been one of the bulwarks of autocracy, of serfdom, of all the dark elements, of all reaction. But we should be much mistaken if we thought that other religious organizations, other religious trends, were on the side of revolution. . . .

". . . Of course, the struggle which exists between the different trends of the Orthodox Church, between the various groups of the sectarians, weakens, up to a certain point, the influence of the clergy. But we must not overrate this. On the contrary, we cannot lay too great stress on the influence of religious organizations. . . .

". . . In our cities a third of the pupils of the second-grade schools still attend church and pray. . . . Till now some of the teachers—the pedagogues and the professors—continue to believe and pray. In our industrial enterprises ikons can still be found on the walls of the workmen's rooms; all kinds of preachers, women-preachers, and evangelists visit them and preach there. The religious organizations sometimes mobilize all their forces to prevent the acceptance of some serious measure. We must keep in mind that parish church soviets and similar organizations embrace at least a million of the population, that this part of the population is the most reactionary, and that it has been pushed forward with the express purpose of furthering the influence of religious organizations. This part of the population is generally made up of 'kulaki,' of the former socialists and Menshevicks, or the remnants of the representatives of the former government. These are all the most reactionary elements.

"The religious organizations oppose all educational and political-revolutionary enterprises of the Soviet Government. They are hostile

towards the Communist Party, towards the Comsomol, towards the Pioneer Movement. The godless Comsomol and the godless pioneer groups have an immense political significance; they create a great force for the educational revolution and are a threat against the existence of religious organizations. They undermine the very roots of these organizations; they educate a godless generation; they prepare the anti-religious army. . . .

". . . We must not forget that the religious standpoint is for many, many peasants the very basis of their whole ideology. If you pull one screw, one stone, one brick out of this edifice, the whole building will become unstable. The believer begins to ask other questions which are connected with his religious viewpoint. This has been very well understood by our comrades who know the organization of our entire religious work in the clubs.

" 'If we are to judge by the speeches and the notes which are presented during our meetings,' writes Comrade P. Guinsburg, in his article, *Anti-religious Propaganda and the Professional Educational Work,* we come to the conclusion that the questions which interest the workmen most of all are: The origin of man and of the earth (If there is no God from where does man come?) ; the origin of religion, of holidays, rites; all questions which stand in connection with the class meaning of religion; (Why can a communist not believe in God?) ; all questions of a religious-political character (Why are the churches not closed; Why are religious holidays still kept?).

"These same questions are repeated during each meeting quite independently of the theme that is being discussed.

"This makes it quite clear that anti-religious propaganda cannot be limited by one side of the question only. It is necessary to throw light on all sides of the problem; these problems must be taken in all their depth, and all questions having any connection with religion must be answered.

"The Association of the Godless acts in this manner. It connects its work in the villages with agricultural and other measures for improving the condition of peasant farms; for introducing a more rational manner of farming. The groups of the godless are among the most active leaders of every kind of agricultural improvements, of coöperative organizations, etc.

"Of course, the very existence of such an anti-religious organization as that of the Association of the Godless influences the population. This influence is strongest among the pioneers, the comsomoltzy. This coming generation destroys all the religious customs of every-day life; they are the strugglers for life without religion, and this very struggle is in itself a kind of educational revolution. This is a difficult struggle. It has not

been easy to insist that no religious education should be given in the first and second-grade schools; yet even now it sometimes happens (not often) that the local soviet sends away the teacher because he is an anti-religious propaganda agent. This happened in the Jaroslav province.

"But it has grown very clear by this time that we cannot limit our efforts to making education non-religious. We must take measures to make education anti-religious. The *Teacher's Newspaper* has sent out very interesting questionnaires, the theme being 'Non-religious or anti-religious education?' More than 100 answers have been received, 100 stand for anti-religious education; fifteen for non-religious; and only two to three for a religious one.

"Investigations in one of the schools of the Zamoskvoretzk region have proved that in the first class there are twenty-three religiously-minded children out of a group of thirty-four; in the fourth class the number is only eight out of thirty-three; while in the seventh class the number of religiously-minded is again seventeen out of thirty-two, *i.e.,* more than half.

"In one of the schools a lady-teacher of the second class relates how she was explaining to the children the origin of rain and thunder. She had explained it practically and theoretically, and thought that all the children had understood the point. She was going to pass on to the next subject, when suddenly one of the little boys asked her, 'How then about Elijah the Prophet?' 'Why do you speak about such fairy-tales?' asked the lady-teacher. 'Oh, you must not say this; these are not fairy-tales.' The teacher was obliged to explain all about the prophet. In one of the schools the following legend is related as to the origin of thunder: 'Judas, with fetters on his feet and hands, has run away from hell. The Prophet Elijah has been sent to catch him and he is shouting after him, but always missing him. Therefore he is running all over the world.'

"Thus life itself demands imperatively that we should pass over to an active attack on the anti-religious front. On the questions of anti-religious education, our struggle against the demons of darkness, against religious education in the home or in the church, we must oppose the direct attacks of religious organizations on the child, the youth, and the adult by a counter-attack of anti-religious propaganda everywhere where the Soviet Government takes upon itself the problems of education.

"There is no doubt that in the question of anti-religious propaganda we have made mistakes when we closed *en masse* churches and other temples. However, the transformation of churches, monasteries, synagogues, and mosques into clubs, schools, community buildings, and other educational institutions has, on the whole, been a very useful measure. Now we make the mistake of forcibly closing churches much less fre-

quently. There is no longer any administrative pressure. When such a measure is adopted, it is done after preliminary preparation; when the desirableness of such a step is clearly seen by the peasants themselves; when the workmen wish that their church should be transformed into an educational institution."

The following quotations are Soviet cries from the depths:

Pravda, No. 88, Moscow, April 13, 1928:

"There Are Many Godless: There Are No Workers on the Anti-Religious Front

"During the latest provincial conferences of the godless, the representatives of the Central Soviets of the Godless and the local delegates admitted: 'There are many godless. The number of unbelievers is growing larger among the workmen and the peasants.'

"But during the two last years the activity of the Church has increased. The party men do not lead a systematic anti-religious struggle. 'We do not believe in God and there is no reason for us to bother about the question.' In other words, 'It does not touch me; I know nothing about it.' But the fact remains that religion is a weapon in the hands of our class foes.

"The professional and working clubs do not look upon anti-religious work as a part of their every-day educational work.

"The organizations of the godless generally work only in the clubs and once or twice a year, at Christmas and Easter, make an attack among the masses.

"In the whole U. S. S. R. there are only 123,000 members of the Association of the Godless. Of course, there are millions of unbelievers in the U. S. S. R., but they are not active on the anti-religious front.

"The religious organizations have on the contrary about 2,000,000 active (promoting) members. And these members are carrying on propaganda each day.

"The clergy and the sectarians are carrying on a wild propaganda. It would be useless to imagine that only old women and old men go to church. Hundreds and thousands of young workmen can be found in churches and in the sectarian prayer houses. In the Ivanovo-Voznesensk province there are 660 religious communities and 174,300 members. Of this number 2,000 are active priests and sectarian fathers. There are only thirteen anti-religious groups in the province counting a total of 200 members.

"And the same picture is to be found not only in Ivanovo-Voznesensk. In Novgorod the city soviet of the godless collected only 2 r. 81c in a year.

"Sometimes even the secretary of the party groups, instead of helping the godless, puts spokes into the wheels of their work. Thus, for instance, in the town of Bogorodsk in a cotton mill (4,000 workmen, 200 godless), the secretary of the group expressed the desire that the journal *Biezbojnik U Stanka (Godless of the work bench),* should not be circulated in the factory. 'The journal is not to be received any more; there is nobody to spread it, and in general it is not our business.' Thus we may expect that the *Biezbojnik* will be looked upon as illegal in Bogorodsk.

"Even in the Putiloff plant there are twenty groups, but only four of them are at all active. The factory bureau does not guide the work. The propaganda agent of the godless group joined the army in autumn and till now his successor has not been chosen.

"If this is the manner in which anti-religious propaganda is carried on in the large factories, what can we say of the villages? Does the Association of the Godless make use of the mental force of the village (the doctor, teacher, etc.) to give a rebuff to the attacks of the ever more and more self-sure religious groups?"

"Our better qualified propaganda agents and anti-religious leaders do not go out into district, town, and villages. The disputes on religious subjects are also more often held in Moscow. Yet the qualified propaganda agents of religion (bishops, preachers, etc.) often go out into the provinces to all kinds of monasteries and prayer houses. This is often materially lucrative and is also a means of propaganda. Their public speeches are generally accompanied by a certain pomp. 'The Bishop is coming; the choir has been invited to sing.'

"As a result we see that after the departure of a bishop the workmen begin to discuss the beauties of divine service. And the group of the godless sleeps. Many sects have undertaken important economic work. They open their coöperative stores, their sewing groups, or agricultural groups. The sectarians often draw to their cause the poorest peasants by giving material aid. The moral ties of a sect grow stronger by mutual economic help. Some sects forbid the members of one family to break up into separate homes. And a large family is generally a powerful economic unit. The preachers pretend that this well-being is the result of God's grace, which is sent from heaven to the members of the sect.

"The sectarians have also undertaken a great work among the children; they try to attract them by games, by playgrounds, singing, etc.

"The godless say: 'Our advantage is that time and the revolution are working on our side.' But such an idea must be refuted.

"We are obliged to answer the energetic activity of our foes by an

energetic anti-religious propaganda. As soon as we take up the work seriously we shall see the results. We have not far to look for an example. In Samara, as soon as the anti-religious museum was moved into a well-heated house, the number of visitors increased from 7 to 200. The godless must be the channels of an educational revolution. The every-day anti-religious work must be connected with the work of the party and with Soviet authority. It is time for our anti-religious work to pass over from group work to work among the masses. The youth among the workmen and the peasants must also be induced to take part in it. The Association of the Godless ought to number many millions among its numbers.

"The party groups must declare a decided warfare against the indifferent attitudes of the communists and the comsomoltzy towards this important work. The work on the anti-religious front must be looked upon as one of their duties."

The following was published in *Biezbojnik,* November 17, 1928, under the caption:

"ANTI-RELIGIOUS WORK AMONG THE MASSES"

(From the Report of Comrade Krinitzky, Director of the Propaganda Section of the Z. K. V. K. P. (Central Committee of the All-Russian Communist Party.) Read during the Propaganda Conference, March 30th.)

"We notice that the various kinds of sectarian organizations have been more active lately. The Church and the sectarians are energetically carrying on their work among the masses. The funds for this work are chiefly collected among the Nepmen, the Kulaki. The Church members try to study anti-religious literature, and the diocesan congress in the Tula province ordered the priests to read the *Capital* of Marx. Here and there organizations of the 'Christomol' groups have been founded of the believing youth, in imitation of the Comsomol organizations. In some of the districts of the Samara province about 50 per cent of the youth belong to them. In the Melitopol district about 90 per cent of the youth is under the influence of the Baptists' Young Men's Association. The Church members organize something similar to the Red Corners. In the Tcherepovetz district the priest has organized a Red Corner for which he subscribes to the magazine, *Comrade of the Propaganda Agent,* the *Village Communist.* The sermons are often of a political character. The priests touch upon the October manifesto, upon international affairs, upon military danger, and they also stand up for the *Kulaki.*

"In the Soviet Union there are about 40,000 or 50,000 churches—these strongholds of religious work. There are 300,000 priests of differ-

ent denominations. There are from 500,000 to 1,000,000 members of Church councils—these are the lay upholders of the clerical spirit. There are from 100,000 to 200,000 monks.

"There are tens of millions of believers who tend towards the Church, who profit by the services of the Church. Even in some of the workmen districts we notice that the influence of the Church is growing (the Nediejdinsky region in the Ural, the Vladimir province). Yet all active anti-religious work evokes the sympathy of the workmen and takes them away from the Church. This was the case in the Vladimir province, where the non-party men grouped themselves round the communists and easily ousted the priests from their positions."

Along the same line we find in *Pravda,* No. 137, Moscow, June 15, 1928:

"IN THE MOSCOW COMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY (V.K.P.) ON THE ANTI-RELIGIOUS FRONT

"The bureau of the M. K. V. K. P. (Moscow Committee of All-Russian Communistic Party) has listened to the report of the Association of the Godless. The bureau has stated that lately an improvement has been visible in the guidance given by the Party to anti-religious propaganda, in the attention paid to it by professional and political educational organizations. However, the bureau of the M. K. still states that the improvement has not been radical enough when we take into consideration the increasing activity of religious elements, especially in the villages. The fundamental defect of anti-religious propaganda is that its contents and the forms it adopts are very primitive; that the anti-religious propaganda and the political, educational, and scientific work do not stand in sufficiently close contact; that there is very little popular literature; and that the work is not carried on among the masses. The M. K. thinks that it is necessary to set apart special funds and special qualified workers so that the wide masses should come under the influence of anti-religious propaganda and that new active anti-religious members should be prepared. These funds and workers should be set apart by the political educational institutions, by the educational professional associations and coöperations, by the propaganda sections of the Comsomol, and by the scientific-social organizations.

"The propaganda section of the M. K., as well as that of the S. B. (Association of the Godless), has been charged with working out the theoretical problems connected with anti-religious propaganda; to find out whether it would be useful to organize special seminaries in the V. U. Z. Y.; also, to decide in how far one could make use of the museums as a means of anti-religious propaganda (Excursions under the

guidance of experienced instructors, the scientific staff of the museums; their number should be increased by younger, aspiring members).

"The section of the Moscow Soviet has been asked to give all the aid it can to the development of an anti-religious museum, which is being organized by the Central Section of the Association of the Godless.

"A series of measures for the improvement of anti-religious literature have been planned. For instance, it has been decided to organize regularly, literary conferences so as to improve the quality of literature.

"It has been declared that the publication of religious, priestly literature is not to be admitted. At present this kind of literature is being widely spread. The question which has already been asked many times by the progressive elements of our working class, namely, the usefulness of replacing religious festivals by revolutionary ones, is to be once more carefully discussed."

More recently the consternation of the Soviets has increased, as is shown by the following from *Comsomolskaya Pravda*, No. 143, Moscow, June 22, 1928:

616 Religious Communities as Opposed to the 66 Groups of the Godless

"Kiev has always been one of the largest strongholds of religion. From olden times it has been famous for its monasteries, its holy relics, and other instruments of religious mystification. Even now it is a center that is by no means harmless.

"In Kiev and in the villages surrounding it there are 3,500 sectarians. There are 147 religious communities in the city and 469 in the villages—a total of 616. Of this number 301 belong to the Old-Slavonic group.

"The Old-Slavonic (Tikhonian) Church is the one that is most influential. It possesses a large army of priests, and has a solid material foundation. It has a large group of 'instructors'—wandering monks, who carry on the propaganda in the villages, hamlets, and small towns.

"Here also we find a curious women's department, the so-called sisterhoods. The wandering monks and 'sisters' organize pilgrimages to 'holy' places, such as Staroselie, the Kievo-Petcherskaya Lavra, the monastery of St. Jonah, etc."

"Qualified and Super-Qualified Priests

"The autocephalic Church is also very influential in the Ukraine. It seeks for support amid the Ukrainian middle class and rich bourgeoisie. It sings *Te Deums* in commemoration of the anniversary of Petliura's entrance into Kiev. From time to time new reinforcements of young and old 'super-qualified priests' are added to it from the Kievo-Petcherskaya

monastery. These priests have graduated from the 'High Theological Course of the Ukraine.' The autocephalic Church is famous for its fine singing; it receives its funds from a somewhat curious self-imposed taxation of the church members.

"Lately an underhand, hidden Jewish Khedera has begun to be widely spread; also so-called 'Tribunals of the Rabbis'; here dozens of Jewish children are being influenced in a certain direction; here also the 'faithful' seek protection, advice, and help.

"The religious members have a numerous army of preachers: 2,224 can be found in and around Kiev alone. The number of Church members is: 261,121 for Kiev and its surroundings, and 50,692 for the city alone (everywhere we find a preponderance of women). Lately the number of workmen has decreased considerably. In 1926 there were 18,423 workmen in the communities, and in 1927 only 15,895. But the number of small industrials has increased threefold."

"Those Who Think and Those Who Miss Their Chance

"What, then, is made by our anti-religious groups and our educational organizations to counter-balance the influence of the Church members? Neither the party nor the Comsomolsky groups, neither the factory nor the local committees take any interest in the anti-religious movement. 'Let those whose business it is think about those matters.'

"And as result we see that in and near Kiev there are only 66 groups of the godless with a membership of 960 men. In 36 groups there are only 398 active members and in one anti-religious 'seminar' there are only 27 students."

CHAPTER IV

Inner Life of the Church in 1928

WHILE we have been thinking of the Church as an organism thrilled with new life, it has been natural to allow our minds to picture a people loyal to a sacred obligation, or treasuring an instrument for personal comfort and help; and forget the great inner spiritual movement. We are devoting this chapter, therefore, to a long quotation from a private letter from Russia printed in Paris, that reveals the Inner Life of the Church.[1]

"Now, as formerly, the Church is the national sanctuary. Nowhere but in the Church does one find the breaking down of class barriers, the liberating joy of unity, of communion between many people otherwise held far apart from each other. But the worshippers are not the same as ten years ago. Ordinary, simple folk no longer fill the churches. Rather one sees a majority of the intellectuals, particularly in the cities. These are of very different types and have been brought to the Church in many different ways. Some find in her arms consolation for their bereavement, some a shelter for their wounded love of country. Others, the young and hopeful, are not driven to her by sorrow and suffering, but are attracted by love and hope and by the youthful enthusiasm that the Church awakens in them. Many of our clergymen and bishops now come from the ranks of the laymen. It would be an exaggeration to say that the intellectuals outnumber the others, but they are a very considerable fraction of our congregations. Many workmen attend the suburban churches, as do many tradesmen. The latter have somewhat resumed their place in society, with the economic regeneration of the country, and, more than any other class, retain both the outward appearance and the conservative traditions of the old Russia.

[1] Pont, *Russian Religions. Philosophical Quarterly,* No. 2, pp. 3-12. Quoted by G. P. Fedotoff, *The Russian Church Since the Revolution.*

"And what of their numbers? They are very large, but it is difficult to say whether they form a minority or a majority of the nation. We have no accurate statistics, and can judge only by the size of our congregations. Our churches are filled, but not to overflowing. When we consider that the edifices turned over to the Living Church are practically empty, it would appear that the total attendance is smaller than before the revolution. Neither is it increasing rapidly. The terrible years of 1917-1920 were a period of religious revival. Since then conversions have been less frequent. That part of the intelligentzia which stood aloof from the Church is not caught up in the present stream of return to it; it is deeply rooted in the old trenches of positivism or absorbed in the search for material well-being. Among the city poor, the Baptists and different sects of 'Brethren' find many new adherents. The simplicity of their moral preaching and the strictness of their personal lives attract many. Among the cultures, the old infatuation for Tolstoi, theosophy, and even for Roman Catholicism has vanished. The Orthodox Church has rallied to itself practically all the truly religious-minded among our intellectuals. One consolation is that we have no more 'dead leaves,' in the phrase of Tiutcheff. None among us attends in order 'to do the proper thing,' or 'to stand well in the community.' On the contrary, some are prevented from attending because they hold official positions. Those who come, pray here as perhaps they never before prayed.

"In the villages we witness a different picture—although our knowledge of conditions there is far less general. We can judge only from what we see in villages near a railway, and consequently more or less influenced by city manners. Unquestionably Russia still has a great number of secluded corners where conditions remain as they have been for centuries, almost untouched by the revolution. But can there be many such corners, after the tremendous upheaval which rocked the very foundations of the nation?

"The first thing we notice in the villages is that the churches are nearly empty. As a rule, only women and old men attend service. The youth have imbibed the teaching of atheism. The middle-aged who have come back from the war, after travelling far and wide over the world, have brought with them a large dose of scepticism, or at least religious indifference. Only now is the village living through a period of enlightenment, two hundred years behind the rest of Europe, but without special enthusiasm at that. The sound common sense of our peasants makes them incurably suspicious of all kinds of theories, which have so much attraction for our city laborers. Nevertheless, this propaganda undermines the old faith. So the peasant is preoccupied just now with what he considers practical things. He has become intensely interested in the

cultivation of the soil. He has lost the feeling of mystery that formerly surrounded his conceptions of agriculture. But he has a conservative instinct that makes him want to keep the Church as a ritualistic institution. Girls rarely consent to marry without a religious ceremony, and even the Communists are obliged to yield to this 'superstition.' Children are still baptized; the burial service is read; the traditional Church holidays are observed. There is a peculiar renaissance of ethnographic ceremonies, practically pagan, and recently even of real paganism in the North of Russia, resulting from a dual faith. But alongside you find new ideas which are penetrating into the villages by means of Communist newspapers, the cottage library, dramatic presentations, and the revolutionary songs of the youth.

". . . As a general rule the authority of the episcopacy is now weakened at the expense of the growing influence of the lower clergy and laymen. This does not contradict the increased longing for authority and a canonical basis for the life of the Church. However, spiritual authority frequently outweighs canonical authority. In this matter also the present moment is one of change. It is necessary to review and to make over many things. For instance, many of the darker aspects of parish democracy have come to light. There are well-founded charges that the exceptional influence of laymen in the parish at times interferes with the independence of the priest.

"As is well known, national shrines and monasteries throughout the whole of Russia have been desecrated and destroyed. But it is probably not known to all that this destruction was not complete. As heretofore, in the summer time, pilgrims go on foot to the shrine of St. Seraphim,[2] and to Kiev for Assumption. Sometimes there appear new centers of pilgrimage, as in Podolia, where a vision of the Crucifixion served as the occasion for a great movement of pilgrims. The need for miracles, the thirst for visions of heavenly mysteries, is still strong in all ranks of Church people, though it was especially marked during the years of persecution and famine.

"Even *startchestvo*[3] has passed beyond the confines of monastic walls. Sometimes a parish priest famous for his ascetic life and deep spiritual insight becomes known as a *staretz*. Not infrequently he is a priest deprived of his parish by the Soviet authorities. Such men wield great influence over large numbers of people. These non-monastic *startzy* oc-

[2] In April, 1927, the monastery at Sarow was closed, and the relics of St. Seraphim removed to an unknown destination.

[3] *Startchestvo:* the institution or custom of turning for spiritual guidance to aged and particularly venerated monks, popularly known as *startzy,* famous for saintliness and spiritual gifts.

cupy somewhat the place of father-confessors to their followers. Their influence, which is more wide-spread than formerly, must be regarded as a new feature of Russian life.

"The influence of father-confessors is not limited to the sacrament of confession, but occasionally, directing the whole of life in all its daily difficulties and trials, the father-confessor becomes the director of conscience.

"The ascetic and mystical strain is particularly noticeable in modern religious tendencies. It is evident, for instance, in the attraction which laymen find in the ascetic literature of the early Church. However, this tendency is not the only, perhaps not the dominating one, for along with it there is active, practical Christianity, finding various forms. Occasionally it bears the character of Orthodox 'evangelism,' giving primacy to active love. Under present conditions such evangelic love is closely related to the regeneration of the apostolic ideal—preaching the Gospel. You meet many people, touchingly selfless, who give themselves entirely over to the task of saving their brothers, sowing the Word of Life, and laying up nothing for the morrow.

"Christian thought suffers more than Christian life from severe oppression. The Word is in fetters, intercourse between individuals very limited. We know that many write without any hope that they will see their books published. This gives an exclusive importance to oral teaching. The pulpit, also bound by official fetters, cannot satisfy the great thirst, though it has given birth to many remarkable preachers. Among them we witness the tendencies of which we have already spoken as existing in the whole Church—ethical questions and questions regarding apologetics are the prevalent ones. The vacancy that cannot be filled by public speech is often satisfied by private intercourse. At the present moment it has reached in Russia a very high degree of intensity. It often manifests itself in corporate prayers; the absence of scientific organization is supplemented by the intensity of religious fervor. In such an atmosphere even abstract differences of opinion and theoretical disputes—very hot sometimes—do not generally produce any ill-feeling, and inner separation; do not stand in the way of a brotherly communion between people of very different points of view. Life in the midst of a Church that is persecuted, life in the midst of Christ's enemies, face to face with schism, constant communion in the same divine service and in the sacraments—all this produces a feeling of great unity even among those following different tendencies and possessing different religious opinions."

THE LIVING CHURCH

BY

PROFESSOR SERGIUS TROITSKY

Candidate of Theology of the Petrograd Academy of Divinity
Master of Theology of the Kiev Academy of Divinity
Professor of Jurisprudence
of the
Subotitski Faculty of Jurisprudence
(Branch of the University of Belgrade)
Expert of the Sacred Prelate Sobor of the Serbian Church

Edited and rearranged by

WILLIAM CHAUNCEY EMHARDT

What Does the Living Church, the Renovated Church, or the Synodical Church, Stand For?

"All that is impure must not be used."
(19th Rule of the Seventh Ecumenical Council. Words of St. Basil.)

PREFACE

IT IS indisputable that the Living Church is an important, though a negative phenomenon.

According to the latest statistical data published in the official organ [1] of this Church, there were on January 1, 1927, 84 dioceses, 140 bishops, 10,815 members of the clergy, and 6,245 parishes belonging to it.[2]

The Catholic propaganda agent and Director of the Papal Bible Institute, Michael D'Herbigny, who has visited Russia more than once, asserts in his book: *L'Aspect religieux de*

---

[1] *Viestnik Sviashchennago Sobora Rossiiskoi Tzerkvi* (Messenger of the Holy Council of the Russian Church), 1927, No. 2, pp. 9 and 17. *Russkoe Vremie,* No. 217, Feb. 28, 1926.

[2] These figures are taken for the whole of the Living Church, including the dioceses of the Ukrainian Living Church. This Church declared its autocephalia during the Sobor (Council) in Kharkoff, May 8, 1925. The Moscow Sobor of October 6, 1925, sanctioned this autocephalia. The *Bielorusskaya* (White Russian) Living Church is also included in these figures, though its autonomy had been accepted earlier in May, 1925. According to the same official statistics, the Ukrainian Church consisted of 16 dioceses, 36 bishops, and 3,000 parishes. The *Bielorusskaya* Church of 4 dioceses, 6 bishops, and 500 parishes (*Viestnik,* 1926, No. 7, p. 2). The history of the establishment of the Ukrainian Church has been published in its own organ, *Golos Pravoslanoi Ukrainy* (The Voice of the Orthodox Ukraine), 1925, No. 1-2; in an article, "How the Ukrainian Holy Synod was Established." Regarding the acceptance of its autocephalia, see D'Herbigny, *Church Life in Moscow,* pp. 71-72. The list and portraits of its bishops can be found in the Ukrainian Orthodox *Blagovistnik* (Messenger of Good News), 1926, No. 6, p. 1.

Moscow (Translated into Russian under the title, *Church Life in Moscow*[3] that according to the words of a Tikhonian bishop, 35% of the Church members in the provinces and 20% of them in Moscow belong to the Living Church. The members of the Living Church themselves consider that about a quarter (21.4%) of all the Orthodox population of Moscow belongs to it.[4] If these figures are to be taken as even approximately correct we are obliged to admit that in membership the Living Church occupies the second place in the Orthodox Church in Russia; that is, if we still look upon the Living Church as being "Orthodox."

This Church is important not only because of its numbers, but also because of its organization. It has already convoked two Councils (Sobor) in 1923 and in 1925, and is making preparations for a third one to be held in 1928. It possesses its own Synod, its own diocesan and parish organs,[5] theological academies and courses,[6] and it also publishes several journals, recently it has been corresponding officially with the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem. The new Patriarch of Alexandria also is favorably inclined towards it. The representative of the Patriarch of Antioch assisted at the meetings of its Synod. Catholics and Americans are favorably disposed towards it. It also attempts to subject to its authority the Russian Churches beyond the frontiers of Russia. In France, Germany, Denmark, Greece, and America these attempts have been partly successful. November 27, 1925, the appellate judge of the Supreme Court of New York ruled

[3] Both editions appeared in 1926: the French in Rome, the Russian in Paris.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 235. Russian translation 67; compare with *Viestnik* of the Holy Synod, 1927, No. 2. The Orthodox parishes are calculated at 33,696.

[5] *Viestnik* of the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Russian Church, *Church Life (Tzerkovnay Jizn)*, the Irkutsk Church *Viestnik, Permskie Eparkhialnye Viedomosti, Ukrainsky Blagovistnik, Pravoslavny Permsky Viestnik* in Kazan, and others.

[6] The Living Church has its Theological Institute in Petrograd, a Theological Academy in Moscow, a high-grade Theological School in Kiev, and Theological Courses in Rostoff (on the Don), Krasnodar, Kursk, Orenburg, Ufa, and other cities.

that the representative of the Living Church, John Kedrovsky, should be considered the legal proprietor of the Russian Orthodox Cathedral and of all church property in New York. Consequently, Metropolitan Platon had to surrender them to Kedrovsky. At present Kedrovsky is intriguing to secure all the property of the 200 Russian parishes in the U. S. A. The American tribunal has already granted him the property of 115 of the parishes.* The Living Church is actively struggling to attain authority in the Far East: in Japan, China, Korea. At all events the Living Church is an entity which must be taken into consideration. To get at a clearer idea of what our attitude towards it should be, I shall first give an outline of its history, then go on to describe its teaching, finally I shall attempt to give an appreciation of its canonical and moral value, and a summary of its teaching, its organization, and its activity.

* This is not correct. The court appointed a receiver for the properties and later ordered the title deeds transferred to Kedrovsky. Inasmuch, however, as these properties are in different commonwealths, possession may only be had by independent action in each case. Thus far no property outside the state of New York has been awarded to Kedrovsky by the courts.—W. C. E.

CHAPTER I

The History of the Living Church

THE foundations of the Living Church were laid by a few Petrograd priests; May 12, 1922, may be considered the initial moment of its history. It was then that this group attempted to usurp authority over the whole Russian Church.

On May 12th several priests came to Patriarch Tikhon and spoke with him regarding the necessity of organizing a Church Administration, because the Patriarch himself had been deprived of authority. However these priests did not wait to receive an answer from the Patriarch. May 16th they handed in the following statement to the chairman of the V. Z. I. K. (All-Russian Central Executive Committee), Kalinin:

"Herewith we inform you that in consequence of Patriarch Tikhon having himself abdicated, we have thought fit to establish a High Church Administration which should exercise authority in all Church questions within Russia." [7]

"However, it was necessary to give some legal semblance to this self-appointed usurpation of Church authority. Therefore on May 18th the same group of priests that had usurped authority presented itself once more before the Patriarch. It did this with the sanction of Soviet authority. The Patriarch himself describes this visit of the group of priests in his epistle written from the Donskoi Monastery and published July 15, 1923:

"On the 18th of May, inst., the priests Vvedensky, Bielkoff, Kali-

[7] *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1927, No. 3, p. 21.

novsky, came to visit us. We were then imprisoned in the Troitzkoe Podvorie. Kalinovsky was no longer a priest at that time. He had himself renounced holy orders. These priests came to us under the pretext of anxiety for the welfare of the Church, and handed us a written statement[8] in which they complained that, as a result of the present situation all the business of the Church had come to a standstill. They asked us to entrust the organization of our chancery to them, so that all papers that had been accruing could be looked through and a decision regarding them taken. Thinking this a useful measure, we gave our consent in the following words: The undersigned (*i.e.,* the priests who had handed in the petition) are entrusted to take over all the business of the Synod, passing it on to His Eminence Agathangel[9] on his arrival to Moscow. Secretary Noumeroff is to take part in the work.[10]

---

[8] We quote the text of this statement: "Because Your Holiness has been set aside from the administration of the Church until such a time as a Sobor should be convoked, and because the said authority has been given over to one of the oldest members of the clergy, it happens that at present the Church remains in reality without any administration. The influence of this on the whole life of the Moscow diocese is excessively harmful and creates much trouble among the congregation. Therefore we, the undersigned, have received the permission of the existing state authorities to establish a chancery for Your Holiness. Herewith we, the faithful sons of Your Holiness, beg you to bless this step, which was undertaken in order to avoid a further harmful standstill in all the business of Church administration. As soon as your *locum tenens* will arrive, he will immediately take upon himself the functions with which he is entrusted. As a temporary measure we shall employ in the work of the Chancery such holy members of the clergy as are at present in Moscow and are not imprisoned, until the time when your *locum tenens* shall arrive and be able to organize the administration (see Archives, Methodius, *The Living Church,* Harbin, 1926, pp. 8-9; *Viestnik,* 1927, No. 1, pp. 8-9).

[9] Two days before the second visit of the group, May 16th, Patriarch Tikhon had given authority to Metropolitan Agathangel in the following words: "In consequence of the extreme difficulties existing in the Church administration, because of my being arraigned before the secular tribunal, I deem it well for the good of the Church to place you at the head of the Church administration until the time when a Sobor shall be convoked. The civil authorities have given their consent. Therefore we beg you to come to Moscow with the greatest speed possible. Signed, Patriarch Tikhon. (*Tzerkovnye Viedomosti,* 1922, No. 10-11, p. 1.) Sometimes the adherents of the Living Church try to prove that Patriarch Tikhon had no right to give over his authority to anybody else. Yet they forget that they themselves admit that the right of passing over his authority to another was granted to the Patriarch by the Moscow Sobor, 1917-18 (see *Viestnik* of the H. S., No. 1, p. 8).

[10] The Patriarch quotes only the beginning of the resolution. The full text is published in the Ukrainian organ of the Living Church, *Golos Pravdy,* January, 1925, No. 1, p. 8. Here we read the following: "The administration of the Moscow diocese is to be given over to His Eminence Innocent, the Bishop of Klin. Until the time of his arrival, His Eminence Leonide, Bishop of Vernensk, will

"Thus it is clear that our decision only authorized them to take over the administration for the time being, passing it over to Metropolitan Agathangel as soon as he should come to Moscow. No orders were given by us as to what they should have to do in case Metropolitan Agathangel could not come to Moscow at all, because at that time the possibility of such an occurrence could not be foreseen. No blessing could be given to their replacing the Metropolitan and becoming the head of the Church administration, because authority which can belong only to one bearing the rank of a bishop cannot be given over into the hands of priests. However, they have declared that by our decision we have given over the Church authority into their hands. In union with the Bishops Leonide and Antonin they have organized the so-called High Church Administration, naming themselves members of it." [11]

This account of the deceased Patriarch is quite in accordance with the information given by the members of the Living Church themselves; for instance with that of the secretary of the Sobor of 1925, member of the Synod, Prof. B. V. Titlinoff, who writes:

"There can be no doubt that the group which organized the High Church Administration after the abdication of Patriarch Tikhon was never authorized by the Patriarch to do so. The Patriarch only wanted it to play the part of a mediatory, passing over the business to others. This is not at all the same thing as receiving authority themselves. The leaders of the Living Church usurped authority in a revolutionary, non-canonical manner, even in an anti-canonical manner." [12]

The numerous attempts made to prove that the Living Church had received authority from Patriarch Tikhon are positively condemned by the head of the Living Church,

---

undertake the work. He will be helped by the *Stolonatchalnik* (office manager) Nevsky. I beg that the Archimandrite Anempodist (Alexeeff) be sent to me, so as to facilitate my speedy departure and the installation of His Eminence Agathangel in the Patriarchal House."

[11] In his epistle to the Patriarch of Servia, Dmitri (November 14, 1923), Patriarch Tikhon repeats the history of the usurpation of authority by the Renovated more shortly, but to the same purport: "During our enforced exile from the administration of the Church, several rebellious priests and unworthy bishops rose up against us and created much trouble in the midst of the Russian Church . . ."

[12] *Novaya Tzerkoff* (The New Church), Petrograd-Moscow, 1923, p. 55.

Vvedensky. This is what he writes regarding the five year existence of the Living Church:

"The Renovated Church began its existence by breaking with Patriarch Tikhon. Casuistic scholastics which mumble something about a canonical succession from Patriarch Tikhon and who are sometimes believed by some of the Renovated, are, it seems to me, mistaken and harmful." [13]

The information given by the Bolsheviks repeats in general lines the account given by the Patriarch.[14]

When the "Renovated" had usurped authority they tried to make it more stable at first in the center and then to establish it in the provinces.

Supreme authority was given over to Metropolitan Agathangel. They then set aside this lawful representative of authority. A deputation headed by the priest Krasotkin was sent in June, 1922, to Jaroslav, where the Metropolitan was living. This deputation demanded that he should accept the authority of the Living Church. The Metropolitan not only refused to do so, but issued an epistle (June 18th) in which he condemned the Living Church and gave autocephalic rights to the diocese.[15]

After this he was arrested and first imprisoned in the prison of the G. P. U. and then sent with a party of criminals [16] to Narym.[17]

On May 29th the Legislative Assembly of the Living Church took place. The priests to whom the decision of the

---

[13] *Viestnik,* 1927, No. 4, p. 8.

[14] See for inst. the *Izviestia* V. Z. I. K., May 13, 1922. Here the names of Krasnitzky and of Stadnik are mentioned, besides those of whom the Patriarch speaks as having visited him May 12th on the first occasion.

[15] *Tzerkovnye Viedomosti,* 1922, No. 10-11, pp. 1-2. Compare his epistle published in Perm, April 16, 1926. *Tzerk. Vied.,* 1926, No. 11-12, pp. 5-6.

[16] *Viestnik* uses a somewhat mild expression for this. It writes that Metropolitan Agathangel departed for the district of Narym. Do they want us to believe that he *chose* this country to make a *rest cure?*

[17] See A. A. Valentinoff, *The Black Book,* Paris, 1925, p. 165. The *Viestnik* writes in most polite terms (1927, No. 1, p. 8), that Metropolitan Agathangel could not, after all, come to Moscow "as he had left (of course, as he was bent on pleasure!) for the distant Narym country."

Patriarch had been made known, as well as the Bishops Antonin and Leonide, who were invited, were accepted as representatives of the High Church Administration [18] or of the H. C. A,* as, following the example of the Bolsheviks, this self-elected authority began to name itself. It was also decided to make preparations for the convocation of a Sobor and to "organize during it a movement for the legislative transformation of Church life." The Legislative Committee established a special journal, *The Living Church,* as an organ of propaganda. In order to acquire local authority, it was decided to separate from the rest of the clergy in all the dioceses those who were of one mind with the Living Church; this part of the clergy was to be organized and the administration of the Church given over into its hands.[19] With this in view, 56 representatives of the H. C. A. were sent into the dioceses. These men were endowed with dictatorial authority and were fully upheld by all Soviet institutions, beginning with the G. P. U. itself. These 56 "High-procurators" (as they were nicknamed by one of the members of the Living Church, the priest Kryloff) founded in all dioceses "Diocesan Executive Committees," composed of bishops and priests who had accepted the authority of the H. C. A. After this they began a most severe struggle against the opponents of the H. C. A. Similar to the activity of the H. C. A. itself, their actions were also based on falsehood. They declared that the authority of the H. C. A. was given to it by the Patriarch himself and by his *locum tenens;* that, therefore, they were the agents of lawful authority. Now because both the Patriarch and his *locum tenens* were under arrest and deprived of the possibility of refuting this falsehood,[20] it was believed not only by a great

[18] Casuistic scholastics among the Renovated point out that Leonide was nominated by the Patriarch himself (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 1, p. 9). This is true, but he was nominated only for the administration of the Moscow diocese.

* The term High Church Administration (H. C. A. or V. Z. U.) is the same as Supreme Church Council, used elsewhere.—Editor.

[19] See B. V. Titlinoff, *Novaya Tzerkoff,* pp. 10-12.

[20] A letter of one of the bishops received from Russia shows us how the "persuasion" of the necessary persons was carried on. First of all, the person

number of priests, but also by several bishops. Among those who had been misled was the Vladimir, Metropolitan Sergius (of Starogorod) who later on became the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch.[21] But when all this falsehood did not succeed in duping, when the epistle of Metropolitan Agathangel, so full of wisdom, reached the local authorities, notwithstanding all the measures taken to prevent its delivery; and when these authorities refused to accept the self-elected H. C. A., then falsehood was replaced by oppression.

Even the temporary chairman of the H. C. A., Bishop Antonin, admits that oppression was the usual method of the Living Church's activity. He admits this in a conversation with the correspondent of the official Soviet organ, the *Izviestia* V. Z. N. K.; therefore it is impossible to suspect such a statement of being untrustworthy. Bishop Antonin says: "I receive complaints of it (*i.e.*, of the Living Church) and of its representatives from all corners. The threats, oppression, arrests, and exiles which these latter inflict cause great exasperation against it." [22] Another prominent member of the Living Church, Professor Titlinoff, expresses himself less sharply. He only mentions the tendency the Living Church has to use compulsory measures in its struggle.[23]

---

whom they wanted to draw over to their party was subjected to an imperceptible, yet close supervision. Everybody who could give any undesirable information would be carefully prevented from seeing him. His letters would be confiscated. Whereas, all information "desirable" for the H. C. A. (often very untrustworthy) would be systematically made known in a manner that could not awake any suspicion. We do not give the name of the author of this letter, as he is still in Russia. A priest writes: "In 1922 and in the beginning of 1923 our brains were so befogged that we scarcely knew or saw anything clearly. Because of this mental fog I, too, for the time being, accepted the Renovated Church." (*Viestnik,* of the Russian Christian Student Movement, 1927, No. 7, p. 28.)

[21] According to the information given in the *Viestnik* (1927, No. 1, p. 9) he, as well as the Archbishop of Nijny, Evdokim, and the Archbishop of Kostroma, Seraphim, publicly avowed in print that they looked upon the H. C. A. as the only canonically lawful authority (*The Living Church,* No. 1-5, 1922).

[22] *Izviestia,* 1922, No. 217; 1923, No. 80; compare *Rul,* 1922, XII, 31, No. 635; *Volia Rossii,* 1922, X, 4, No. 1075, Article: "The Church Troubles in Russia."

[23] *Novaya Tzerkoff,* p. 20; compare pp. 15-16. See also the articles of the priest Boyarsky in the *Church Renovation,* 1925, No. 10-11, and those of N. Areffsky: "Metropolitan Sergius and the Holy Synod," published in the Ukrainian

Oppression was exercised against the Higher Church Administration, against the diocesan organs, and even against the parish Council.

Just as the Bolsheviks had earlier seized the apparatus of state authority, so now they seized the administrative apparatus of the Church, as soon as a positive policy for the Church had been established. Thus the coöperation of the state apparatus was assured. The administration was therefore given over to the Living Church, while the Orthodox were deprived of all possibility of creating a new apparatus for themselves. All the organs of the Living Church, beginning with the so-called "Piaterka" (Five members), the H. C. A., and ending with the Synod, had official post and telegraph offices at their disposal and could send their orders and nominations all over Russia; they could punish and show mercy, they could send bread or take it away. But the central and diocesan organs of the Orthodox Church did not even have the right of existing.

According to the decree of the V.Z.I.K. (August 10, 1922) only such organizations could exist as were registered: all the others were reckoned as non-official[24]; yet the decree of 1918 regarding the separation of the Church from the State admits of the right of existence only for small religious groups of citizens, not subject to any central Church authority (Ex-

---

Orthodox *Blagovistnik,* 1927, No. 3, p. 39. In the "Epistles of the Bishops from Solovki to the Government of the U. S. S. R." we read the following: "A great number of Orthodox bishops are imprisoned, because of their unsuccessful struggle against the Renovated heresy; which struggle is looked upon as a protest against the plans of the government (*Viestnik* of the R. St. Chr. M., 1927, No. 7, p. 22).

[24] The Legal Code and the decrees of Soviet Authority regarding religious organizations is given in the book of Professor Gudulianoff, *The Church and the State, According to the Laws of the R. S. F. S. R.,* Moscow, 1923. A French translation of this exists: *La Legislation sovietique contre la religion. Orientalia christiana,* Vol. V, Roma, 1925. See also the book of N. S. Timasheff, *The State and the Church,* in the collection: *The Legislation of Soviet Russia,* Prague, 1925, I, pp. 186-197; also P. V. Gudulianoff, *The Separation of the Church from the State in the U. S. S. R.,* a complete collection of the decrees and official resolutions, edited by P. A. Krassikoff, 1926, Moscow, II, p. 712.

planation given by the Commissariat of Justice August 25, 1922, No. 512). Therefore the Orthodox central Church organs have no legal basis for existence; still less have they the right to publish their orders or decrees (Circular letter of the Commissariat of Justice, May 18, 1920). Their doing so is a crime against the Soviet laws and the Administration of Cults demands, in a circular letter dated May 25, 1923, No. 283, that such orders or decrees should be sent to the G.P.U. and to the procurator. It need scarce be added that such orders are not obligatory for the local Church authorities.

It is not astonishing, therefore, that the higher representatives of the Orthodox Church remain at liberty only as long as the Living Church has hopes of subjecting them to its own authority. As soon as this hope is frustrated, they are immediately sent to prison. Thus prisons have become their constant place of residence. In the above named letter of the bishops, we read: "The Orthodox Church does not receive the right to open any normally acting organs of central or diocesan administration; it cannot transfer its activity into its historically appointed center—Moscow; the bishops are either quite prohibited from entering their dioceses, or, if they are allowed to reside there, they are, at the same time, obliged to refrain from carrying out the most necessary duties of their office, *i.e.,* preaching in church and visiting their parishes; sometimes they are even not allowed to officiate (p. 197)."

Oppressive measures have also been very widely used against the diocesan administration. This was usually done by the representatives of the H. C. A. The first terrible example for all the disobedient was given in the trial of the Tikhonians. Metropolitan Benjamin and his eighty-six adherents were officially accused of withstanding the confiscation of church valuables. However, even before the trial was begun, Metropolitan Benjamin had arrived at a complete understanding with Soviet authority. This had been published in the Soviet organ, *Pravda* (April, 1922). The true reason for the trial against the Metropolitan was his refusal to accept the H.C.A. and his

having excommunicated Vvedensky, member of the Living Church. This Vvedensky was the *instigator and soul of all the proceedings.*[25] He, himself, did not assist at the trial, because he had been wounded by an unknown woman, who threw a stone at him. But he was replaced by another member of the H. C. A., Krasnitzky, who was the chief accuser. This trial was terminated June 5th by a sentence of execution being passed against Metropolitan Benjamin and nine others; and of imprisonment for the remainder of the accused. In the night of 12-13th August, near the station Porokhovoy of the Irinovskaya railway line, a few miles from Petrograd, Metropolitan Benjamin, Father Sergii (Shein), former member of the State Duma, Professor Novitzky, and the lawyer Kovsharoff, were executed.

At the same time the Petrograd Diocesan Executive Committee decided to take away the parishes from all those members of the clergy who did not accept the authority of the H. C. A.[26]

More or less the same took place in Moscow,[27] Kiev,[28]

---

[25] See the very good exposition of the trial in the *Black Book,* pp. 198-236; also the correspondence from Moscow of an unbelieving socialist, but one who bowed down before the courage of Metropolitan Benjamin (*Golos Rossii,* 4/X, 1922, No. 1075). It is interesting to note here that Vvedensky is a baptized Jew. The fact that he was the instigator of the whole trial is indirectly corroborated by one of his own articles, which I possess, namely, *The Church of Patriarch Tikhon,* Moscow, 1923. This is, in fact, an accusation of Patriarch Tikhon as head of the counter-revolution, *i.e.,* of a crime which the Bolsheviks punished by death. Vvedensky assisted personally at the arrest of Metropolitan Benjamin, and during the Sobor of 1923 marveled at the patience of Soviet authority, and said that it was necessary "to put an end to Tikhon" (*Biezbojnik,* 1923, V, 13, No. 21). The copies we have of the letters of Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky) to the Ecumenical Patriarch Basil III (5-18th March, 1926) testify to the Jewish origin of Vvedensky. *Viestnik* quotes, without denying them, the words of Ambrose, former Bishop of Vinnitza, that Vvedensky "is, it seems, of Jewish extraction" (1927, No. 4, p. 23).

[26] *Poslednie Novosti,* 29/VII, 1922.

[27] 13/XII-22. Here seventy-four active Church members were condemned to various periods of imprisonment (*Izviestia* of V. Z. I. K., 1922, XII, 23).

[28] Metropolitan Michael, Archbishop Basil, Bishop Alexei, Bishop Nazarii, Bishop Dmitri, were all arrested in the night from Wednesday to Thursday of Holy Week. All of them, except Bishop Alexei, were sent away "beyond Moscow" (*Za Svobodu,* April, 1923).

Odessa,[29] Minsk,[30] Ekaterinburg,[31] and other diocesan towns. Everywhere the bishops who refused to accept the H. C. A. were exiled and imprisoned. During this period alone the H. C. A. deprived thirty-four bishops of their dioceses; and towards the end of 1923, sixty-six other bishops were exiled.[32] All those who were not sent away were forbidden to preach against the H. C. A.[33]

All diocesan institutions which did not accept the H. C. A. were closed and replaced by those of the Living Church; all the members of such institutions were either exiled or imprisoned. The few diocesan leaders who had, quite by chance, escaped imprisonment, were cut off from the center. They tried to build up some kind of diocesan life, following the wise advice given in the epistle of Metropolitan Agathangel regarding the autocephalia of the dioceses; they organized conferences of the faithful. But the H. C. A. used all the strength of Soviet authority to put a stop to it.

Towards the end of 1922, Krasnitzky handed in a report to the H. C. A.[34] regarding the struggle against the autocephalia of separate dioceses. Among other measures he recommends not only to defrock all the autocephalian priests, and to excommunicate all the laymen, but also to inform the Soviet authority that this movement had "a political character, harmful for the peace of the state, and dangerous for its safety." [35]

---

[29] Regarding the arrest of Archbishop Theodosius and Bishop Alexei, see *Pravda,* 1922, X, 19.

[30] Regarding the arrest of Archbishop Melchizedek, see *Pravda,* 1922, IX, 5.

[31] Regarding the arrest of Archbishop Gregory, see *Pravda,* 1922, IX, 8.

[32] The list of exiled bishops can be found in the *Black Book,* pp. 257-269. Towards the beginning of 1926, eighty Orthodox bishops were sent to Moscow alone. In July, 1926, they were all scattered over the whole of the U. S. S. R. (*Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 7, p. 29).

[33] As for instance by the decree of the Donskoy Diocesan Executive Committee (July 28, 1922, *Pravda,* 1922, VIII, 22).

[34] Published by the *Izviestia* of the V. Z. I. K., December 22, 1922, No. 390 (1729). See also *Rul,* 1922/XII, 31, No. 635.

[35] Regarding the struggle against the autocephalian dioceses in Bielorussia see Bielogursky, "In the Soviet Federation," *Pravda,* 5/IX, 1922.

All religious conferences which were not assembled by the H. C. A. were forbidden at the instigation of the H. C. A. as being dangerous for state authority. But even the official organ of Soviet authority admits that "notwithstanding the exceeding vigilance of the state political administration, a series of conferences of the faithful did take place in Vladimir, Kursk, Rizan, Perm, and other towns. Everywhere resolutions were passed not to accept the H. C. A. and to support the Patriarch Tikhon." [36]

The H. C. A. led a particularly embittered struggle against the parish Soviets, which had been organized by a decree of the Moscow Sobor of 1917-18.[37] On this point the H. C. A. was working hand in hand with Soviet authority, which demanded that severe measures should be taken against counter-revolutionary organizations.[38]

In August, 1922, the First Conference of the Living Church took place in Moscow. This Conference immediately decided to dissolve the parish soviets which opposed the "Renovated" movement, and to reëstablish new ones consisting of individuals recommended (honestly speaking, "nominated" (S.T.) by the priest, who would be responsible for them). Furthermore the Conference proclaimed that only those laymen who accepted and acted according to the principles of the Living Church could be considered as possessing full rights in the Church.[39] The deputation of the Conference visited the chairman of the V.Z.I.K., Kalinin, and asked him to cancel the agreements drawn up between the G.U.I.P. (Provincial Execu-

---

[36] *Izviestia* of the V. Z. I. K., 28th, VIII, 1922.

[37] See the decision taken by the Holy Sobor regarding Orthodox parishes, 7/20, April, 1918.

[38] M. Goreff in the *Krasnaya Gazeta* (14/IX, 1922) threatens the Living Church, "If it will not fulfil the hopes which have been centered on it." The *Izviestia* V.Z.I.K. (3, XII, 1922, No. 274) express the hope that the Living Church will not allow one counter-revolutionary organization to replace the other in the parishes. In an article entitled "Under the Flag of Piety" (5/XII, 1922, No. 275) it praises the Living Church, because "In its struggle against the organizations of the laymen it is meeting the desires of authority half-way."

[39] Titlinoff, *op. cit.*, pp. 16-17. Compare *Krasnaya Gazeta*, 1922, VIII, 12, No. 181.

tive Committee) and the Orthodox parish soviets. At the same time it was proclaimed that the H.C.A. had decided to remove sixty-two other priests who did not accept its authority.[40] The leaders of the Living Church issued a declaration proclaiming the confiscation of the churches of the old parish soviets.[41] After this in many places, for instance, in Bielorussia[42] and in Kiev,[43] a new registration of the parishes took place and only those which accepted them were registered. In other words this meant that all Orthodox parishes were set down as illegal organizations. During the Sobor of the Living Church (October 13, 1925) a certain Kharitonoff proposed that such a new registration should be carried out all over Russia. But evidently the Soviet authority did not consent to this.

While all these confiscations were taking place, everything was being prepared for the new Sobor which was opened in Moscow in 1923 and lasted from April 29th till May 9th.

We have already said that the Legislative Committee of the Living Church had decided to make an organized demonstration during the Sobor; *i.e.*, the members of the Living Church wanted to make people believe that the Sobor of their particular party was a Sobor of the Russian Orthodox Church. This they actually did. The statutes regarding the convocation of the Sobor first of all deprived all the prominent adversaries of the Living Church from participating in it. Clause 6 of its statutes says: "No person who has been tried by the courts during the period of the "Renovated" movement can take part in the Sobor." The members of the Living Church included under this clause first of all Orthodox bishops who had been deprived of their dioceses. The statutes also state "that "there shall be 189 obligatory members of the Sobor; among others the diocesan representatives whose loyalty to the Liv-

---

[40] *Pravda,* 23/VIII, 1922, No. 188.
[41] *Rul,* 1923, I, 20, No. 651; *Poslednie Novosti,* 1923, I, 30.
[42] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1925, No. 3-4, p. 8.
[43] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1923, No. 23-24, p. 16.

ing Church cannot be suspected."[44] The total number of elected members of the Sobor amounts to two hundred eighty-seven, but no freedom in voting could be expected. Only those persons had the right to vote who had not declared themselves hostile to the Living Church. Besides this, Clause 47 gave the H.C.A. the right to replace one elected member by another. The Orthodox bishops also prevented, inasmuch as lay in their power, their flock from voting, therefore it is not to be wondered that only forty-five non-party men, *i.e.*, persons who did not belong to the organizations of the Renovated, were to be found among the Sobor members.

Still it would not be correct to assume that the Sobor of 1923 was an assembly only of the Living Church. Already during the August Conference the Living Church had been divided into several separate parties. One party was the so-called "Church Regeneration," headed by Bishop Antonin; another was the "Ancient Apostolic Association" (Sodaz), headed by Vvedensky.[45] The difference of opinion, especially with Bishop Antonin, was very great. However, the chairman of the V.Z.I.K., Kalinin, who was favorably disposed to Bishop Antonin, declared that it was not desirable that disputes between the different trends of the Renovated should take place.[46] Representatives of all groups, which had not lost "Eucharistic communion," were invited to the Sobor. Thus it presented a "coalition type," something quite unknown to the history of the Orthodox Church.

Many of the members of the Sobor ought from a canonical standpoint never to have been admitted. For instance, the Siberian bishops, who had been ordained by the former Bishop

---

[44] Besides these representatives (Clause 39), the members of the H. C. A. (Clause 37), the Central Committees of the Renovated V. Z. U. (Clause 40), take part in the Sobor groups (Clause 43) and twenty-five members nominated by the H. C. A.

[45] *Izviestia* V. Z. I. K., No. 98, reckon that there were 200 representatives of the Living Church on the Sobor; 116 of the Sodaz, and 10 of the Church Regeneration.

[46] See the *Evening Press*, 1922, XI, 13; *Novoie Vremie*, 1922, XII, 5.

of Kirensk, Zossima (Sodorovsky), took part in it. This Zossima had in 1920 broken his monastic vows, and had entered wedlock, *i.e.*, according to the canons of the Church he had lost the right of being a bishop. Two women also took part in this Sobor. It was also counter to the canons (For inst. Apost. 10, 45, and others) that non-Orthodox members should be given the right of taking part in the discussions. Yet the Methodist Bishop Blake profitted by this permission.

The canons admit only bishops as fully enfranchised members of the Sobor. It was for this reason that during the Moscow Sobor of 1917-18 all decisions and resolutions were controlled by a Committee of Bishops and were legally accepted only after this Committee had given its sanction. But during the Sobor of 1923 the Committee of Bishops was assembled only once to discuss the question of the abdication of Patriarch Tikhon; and on May 4th it was declared that this Committee of Bishops should be assembled no more.[47]

The Sobor of 1923 called itself the "Second Moscow Sobor," seeking thereby to show that it was only carrying on the work of the Sobor of 1917-18. However, this did not prevent the Sobor of 1923 from calling the Sobor of 1917-18 "A counter-revolutionary Assembly" (Resolution of May 3d).[48]

We shall give in chronological order the most important resolutions carried by the Sobor:

May 3d, morning sitting: 1, The anathema against the Soviet authority was annulled; 2, Patriarch Tikhon was deprived of his high office, unfrocked, and reduced to the state of a simple layman; 3, approbation was given to the activity of the Renovated organizations; 4, everybody was invited to uphold Soviet authority, "which alone in all the world could, by the methods of its government, realize the Kingdom of God upon earth"; 5, the patriarchate was abolished, "being an in-

---

[47] *Izviestia* V. Z. I. K., 1923, No. 99. The High Soviet of the Russian Orthodox Church published the Acts of the Second All-Russian Local Sobor (Mospoligraph, p. 20).

[48] *Pravda*, 1923, No. 98, Acts, p. 7.

stitution which had been reëstablished only from political motives"; also because it went counter to the spirit of Christian fellowship; 6, the separation of the Church from the State was sanctioned.

The same day during the evening sitting the Sobor approved marriage for bishops and admitted second marriages for priests.[49]

On May the 4th the Sobor stated that "the bodies of the saints do not decay; however, only for a certain time"; it also decided to close all monasteries, but to keep those which had become labor communities.[50]

On May 5th the Sobor decided to adopt the new calendar,[51] beginning with July 12, 1923.

May 7th the Sobor excommunicated the members of the Karlowitz Sobor.[52]

May 8th the High Church Council was elected to replace the H. C. A.; the Sobor itself was organized on a coalition basis; *i.e.*, ten members of it belonged to the Living Church; six to the Sodaz, and two to the "Regenerated" group. Of these eighteen members five were bishops, twelve priests, and one a layman. The Sobor refused to accept the autocephalia of the Ukrainian Church.[53]

On May 8th a deputation of the Sobor brought to the Patriarch the resolution of the Sobor regarding his abdication. He was at that time imprisoned. On being shown the paper, he wrote on it, "Unlawful! Humble Tikhon, Patriarch of Moscow, and of All-Russia." [54] The Bolsheviks did not publish this fact.

The period following this Sobor was the time of the Living Church's greatest success. Of the "forty-times-forty" churches of Moscow only four or five remained loyal to the

---

[49] *Pravda,* No. 98, Acts, p. 7-8.
[50] *Izviestia,* No. 99, Acts, pp. 11-12.
[51] *Pravda.*
[52] *Pravda,* No. 100, Acts, pp. 12-13.
[53] *Pravda,* No. 101, Acts p. 14.
[54] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1923, No. 9-10, pp. 2-3. This is known from the report sent to the representative of the Ecumenical Patriarchate.

Patriarch. But soon a sharp change unfavorable to the Living Church took place.

On June 26, 1923, Patriarch Tikhon was set at liberty, and on July 1st [55] he took over, with the approbation of the Orthodox bishops, the administration of the Russian Church, and immediately began to struggle against the usurpers of Church authority. July 15th he solemnly read aloud from the pulpit of the Donskoy monastery an epistle addressed to all the bishops, priests, and faithful. In this epistle he declared that the statement of the H. C. A., asserting that he had given over to it the rights and duties of the Patriarch of the Russian Church, was nothing but a "falsehood and a lie"; that Antonin, Leonide, Vvedensky, Krasnitzky, Kalinovsky, and Bielkoff had usurped Church authority in a self-willed manner; that they had used this authority not to build up the Church, but, on the contrary, to sow seeds of pernicious dissension, and to persecute those priests who had remained faithful to their duty. Therefore the Patriarch declared all the depositions of the H. C. A. to be null and void and all the offices and sacraments performed by bishops and priests who had fallen away from the Church to be devoid of Divine Grace. The Patriarch invited the faithful to give him all the aid in their power so as to bring peace into Church life; and implored those who had fallen away to repent and to return to the saving fold of the Only Universal Church.[56]

The epistle of the Patriarch produced a very great impression. The Orthodox gained courage. Little by little a normal Church organization began to be reëstablished. The Orthodox Synod of the Patriarch re-opened its activity. The Patriarch ordained many new bishops to replace those who

[55] This is the date given by the Patriarch himself in his letter to the Patriarch of Servia, Dmitri (November 14, 1923). The minutes of the meeting of the Committee of Criminal Trials of the High Tribunal regarding the liberation of Patriarch Tikhon (25th June) have been published in the *Biezbojnik,* No. 28, 1923, VII, 1.

[56] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1923, No. 15-16, pp. 1-3. See also the epistle of the Patriarch of 27/VI, 1923, which was published in the *Biezbojnik,* I, VII, 1923, No. 28.

had been exiled and executed. And the clergy who had remained faithful to the Patriarch in the dioceses and in the parishes reëstablished local Church administrations.[57] The situation of the Living Church, on the contrary, grew ever more precarious. Father Krasotkin reported to the Sobor of 1925 that the "ranks of the 'Renovated' were beginning to waver." Many of the members of the Sobor of 1923 now turned against it.[58] Among those who returned to the Patriarch at that time were some bishops; for instance, Sergii, Metropolitan of Vladimir,[59] Artemii, Bishop of Petrograd,[60] Seraphim, former Archbishop of Irkutsk, who had been nominated Metropolitan of Bielorussia by the Living Church,[61] Constantine, Archbishop of Moguileff,[62] Vassian, Bishop of Briansk, Vissarion, Bishop of Simbirsk, and others. Of particular importance was the return to the fold of the Orthodox Church of Metropolitan Sergii. Publicly, on his knees, before the Patriarch, dressed in the garb of a simple monk, he made an act of penitence, and after this received anew, from the Patriarch himself, the "Mitra" (cowl) of a metropolitan.[63] Even Krasnitzky himself entered into negotiations with the Patriarch regarding his re-admittance into the fold of the Orthodox Church; and in May, 1924, he (Krasnitzky) published an address to the Living Church, exhorting it to subject itself to the Patriarch.[64] But the Orthodox remained somewhat doubtful as to the sincerity of his demand, and June 26, 1924, the discussions were cut short.[65]

The "Renovated" saw that they had to change their policy:

[57] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 3-4, pp. 8-9.

[58] *Viestnik* of the H. S. (Living Church), 1926, No. 6, p. 14.

[59] Afterwards vice-locum tenens. [60] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 3-4, p. 8.

[61] *Idem.,* 1925, No. 3-4, p. 10.

[62] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, 5-6; compare 1927, No. 3-4, pp. 13-14, the alphabetic list of the Orthodox Bishops.

[63] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 7-8. The Living Church offered Metropolitan Sergii the position of chairman of their Synod. *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 9-10, p. 7.

[64] *Izviestia* V. Z. I. K., 1924, 28/V; compare *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 13-14, pp. 9-10.

[65] *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 15-16; 1925, No. 3-4, p. 7.

"At the outset the tactics of the 'Renovated' were too direct," says Krasotkin during the Sobor of 1925. "The Living Church wanted to rebuild the Church completely, but received a very decided rebuff at this point." And so the tactics are now changed! The spirit of reform, though not quite abandoned, is to be kept only as a blind. During this period a tendency to assume the garb of Orthodoxy comes very much to the fore. Now the Living Church pretends that it is not something new, but that it is the old Orthodox Church. It also pretends that its only point of diversity from the Church of Patriarch Tikhon is that it honestly accepts Soviet authority.

This new policy was first proclaimed by the Second Conference of the Living Church, August, 1923. This Conference did not ask itself whether it was competent to modify the resolutions passed by the Sobor of 1923, but proceeded to some radical reforms, so as to assume a more Orthodox coloring. It began by changing its very name: "Renovated," "Living Church," and calling itself simply: "The Russian Orthodox Church." [66] The High Church Council established by the Sobor

[66] At the present, the members of the Living Church think that they can wipe out the crimes of the Living Church by declaring that the Renovated have nothing in common with it; that the Living Church, headed by Krasnitzky, has been separated from them (see *Viestnik*, 1927, No. 3, pp. 4 and 20). However, Krasnitzky is only made to play the part of the scapegoat which has to be sacrificed and so exculpate the Living Church from its own crimes and even wipe out its very name. But it is impossible to deny that the "Renovated Church" is the direct continuation of the "Living Church," only under a new name. This is admitted now even by the leaders of the movement. "In 1922, at the beginning of the Church upbuilding, we named this movement the Living Church," writes, for instance, P. N. Krasotnin (*Viestnik*, 1927, No. 9-10, p. 39). For the "Renovated" to deny the Living Church presupposes, first of all, the denial of the Sobor of 1923. Yet they themselves affirm that during this very Sobor they played the leading part. If this were not the case, the very origin of the Renovated Church would be incomprehensible. It is true that Titlinoff writes that the "Renovated" declared themselves to be a Church only after the Sobor of 1923 (*Viestnik*, 1927, No. 4, p. 16). But does this not openly declare that they are self-elected and pretenders? "No man taketh honor unto himself," saith the Scripture. Does this not also prove that at least till the Conference of August, 1923, the Living Church was no Church, but only a sect, and that the Sobor of 1923 was a self-instituted assembly? At least Titlinoff seems to think this was the case. Yet, if this were so, how could a sectarian assembly in August, 1923, which even the "Renovated" look upon as only a Conference, transform a sectarian organization into a Church?

of 1923 was replaced by an institution long known to the Russian Church, bearing the name of the Holy Synod. This was composed of twelve bishops, and twenty priests and laymen. At times the Living Church likes to call itself the Synod Church or the Renovated Church.

In connection with this the former official organ of the Renovated, *The Living Church,* is replaced by the *Viestnik of the Holy Synod of the Orthodox Russian Church.*

The Conference also refused to admit the "coalition" principle. It demanded that the authorities should give up their separatism and should adopt the general program. Bishop Antonin and his Church Regeneration *(Vozrojdenie)* did not want to accept this policy, and finally separated himself from the rest of the Church. Because of this he was forbidden to officiate in church (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, p. 3) Krasnitzky also separated himself, keeping the name of Living Church for his small group. The new head of the Living Church, Evdokim, hastened to inform the foreign Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches of all these reforms.[67]

The subsequent activity of the Living Church was carried on under the slogan of "being transformed into an angel of light" (II Cor. 2: 14). The work of the so-called "Great Pre-Sobor Conference" of June 1924 tended this way; as did also that of the enlarged plenary assembly of the Synod at the end of January 1925; and of the new or, according to the terminology of the Living Church, the Third Moscow Sobor in October 1925; and of the enlarged plenary assembly of the Synod in April 1926, and in January-February 1927.

The same member who read a report during the Sobor of 1925 writes: "The holy Synod has been forced to be more careful of its tactics; for it must take into consideration the psychology of the Church masses, who are suspicious of the slightest, though most lawful, innovations. It has been necessary to introduce many practical corrections to the decisions

[67] The text of his cable to America can be found in the *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1924, No. 3 and 4, p. 10.

adopted during the Sobor of 1923, particularly as regards the marriage of bishops and the second marriages of priests. At first the Synod refrained, for the time being, from carrying out the decisions of the Sobor of 1923; and later on the Sobor of 1925 came to the following conclusions: "The Holy Sobor has thought best to leave this question to the decision of the coming Ecumenical Council, and it expresses its willingness to submit to the latter's opinion." [68]

In the program for the Sobor, the leading subject was the question of "Peace within the Church" and in particular by the settlement of the Church schisms. Much time was devoted to finding some means of removing all Church discord.[69]

The address issued by the Sobor October 9th was composed also in a conciliatory tone. Here it was said that we must not abuse the canons of the Holy Church; that if the Living Church did actually usurp Church authority, it was done only because the deceased Patriarch Tikhon had let the reins of authority slip from his hands; "that inasmuch as the marriage of bishops causes some persons to be troubled, this question would in the future be left to the decision of the flock"; that the Sobor accused no one, etc., etc. In the circular letter of the diocesan Administration (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 3, p. 4) the Synod declares that the articles of the Living Church as well as some resolutions and statutes of the groups most carelessly touch upon questions of dogmatic importance; that they must be looked upon only as personal opinions of certain authors, or as the private opinions of separate groups.

Notwithstanding this the Sobor took necessary steps that its majority should belong to the Living Church, and that therefore authority should remain in the hands of the usurpers. According to the statutes of the convocation no one could be a member of the Sobor who had been brought before a civil

---

[68] See the acts of the Third Local Sobor of the Orthodox Church on the Territory of the U. S. S. R. in the *Viestnik of the H. S.* of the Russian Orth. Ch., No. 6. *Cf.* D'Herbigny, *Church Life in Moscow,* p. 85.

[69] The program for the Sobor was published in the *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1925, No. 15-16, p. 14; and in the *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 6.

tribunal (Clause 5). By this clause all the more prominent opponents of the Living Church were set aside. Such sects as the Church Regeneration were not even invited to take part in the Sobor; they were allowed only to hand in a written statement of their needs (Clause 17). The Orthodox (Old Church members according to the terminology of the statutes) were allowed to take part in the Sobor as members possessing full legal rights, but with one important stipulation: that they should profit by this right only after a preliminary agreement between their leaders and the Holy Synod and its local organs as regards the conditions and manner of their election (Clause 16).[70] In other words, this meant that the Living Church wanted to admit the Orthodox to the Sobor in order to give it the semblance and the authority of a Sobor of the whole Russian Church. Yet their members were not to exceed a number which might threaten the predominance of the Living Church. Therefore the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Peter, forbade the Orthodox to take part in the Sobor,[71] and this prohibition was strictly carried out. "All were called, but not all came," complains the above mentioned address of the Sobor, thereby pointing to the absence of the Orthodox.

Let us now take in review the more important resolutions passed by the Sobor. October 3d the Sobor decided to cease persuading the Tikhonian clergy to come to an agreement. This, however, did not disturb the flock.

October 5th the Sobor admitted the legality of the Sobor of 1923, and corroborated the decision accepted during the Conference of that year regarding the new name of the High Church Council—"The Holy Synod." It also proclaimed the separation of the groups of Antonin and Krasnitzky. The use of the old calendar style in some cases was permitted because of local conditions.

October 6th-8th the Sobor accepted the following resolutions: 1, Regarding the High Administration of the Orthodox

---

[70] These rules were published in the *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1925, No. 15-16, p. 13.

[71] The epistle of the 28th/VII, 1925, *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1925, No. 21-22, p. 2-4.

Church within the limits of the U. S. S. R.; 2, Regarding the Metropolias; 3, Regarding diocesan, vicarian, and parish administration; 4, Regarding the normal parish statute; 5, It accepted the autocephalia of the Ukrainian Church contrary to the decision of the Sobor of 1923.[72]

October 9th the Sobor passed a resolution regarding spiritual education and publications; and October 10th it finally accepts the text of the address which is to be sent to the Russian Church and the epistle which is to be sent to all the autocephalic Churches.[73] Of the later resolutions passed by the Living Church, we must further note the introduction of the Russian language into Divine service; also the resolution passed regarding prayers in common and the participation of women in active service in the temple; also the drawing up of the statutes of the order of deaconesses; the acceptance of the autocephalia of the Georgian Church; and the convocation of the Sobor in 1927 (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2).

Besides the resolutions passed during the Sobor, the Renovated, or Living Church introduced a series of measures tending to unite them with the Orthodox Church. The negotiations in this connection carried on directly with the Patriarch and with his *locum tenens,* with the diocesan bishops and even with the parish Councils. But since all the time there was no question of surrendering usurped authority, of repenting for their errors, or of changing their oppressive activity, these negotia-

---

[72] At a later period the Moscow Synod again tried to restrict the independence of the Ukrainian organization. This caused much displeasure in the Ukraine. During Vvedensky's report to the plenary assembly of the Synod (22-XI-1927), (*Viestnik,* 1928, No. 1, p. 13), he says: "The relations with the Ukrainian Church have become less normal. The Ukrainian Synod looks upon us as upon the representatives of Moscow. But we are, so to say, the representatives of the Synod of the whole U. S. S. R. Our functions concern all the Churches (the Georgian as well), which exist within the boundaries of the Soviets. We look upon ourselves as upon a central unity, not as a separate Moscow administrative canonical one. That is why we must remind all the autocephalic Churches that we are a decisive instance for them; just as the Z. I. K. of the Ukraine is part of the Z. I. K. of the U. S. S. R." a strange kind of autocephalia!

[73] The text of all these decisions is published in the first number of the *Viestnik of the H. S.,* 1926, No. 6 and 7.

tions remained fruitless. In fact, the members of the Living Church did not at all want these negotiations to be successful. They needed them only to pacify the conscience of their own adherents in the hope of achieving a communion with the Orthodox Church.

Thus on August the 26th and October the 20th, 1923, there were conferences in Moscow between the representatives of the Patriarch and the Living Church regarding the question of a peaceful decision of all difficulties.[74] But as soon as the negotiations were opened the head of the Living Church, Evdokim, sent *urbi et orbi* false information which aimed at sowing trouble among the Orthodox.

On October the 25th this information was published in the Soviet *Izviestia.* Here, with other information, it was reported that: "The former Patriarch Tikhon had become quite bewildered, and that when he grew conscious of this he handed in a declaration to the Holy Synod regarding his desire to come to an agreement with that part of the clergy and of the people which had separated from him."[75] The mixed committee issued the following resolution (Even though such warm adherents of the Patriarch as Metropolitan Illarion took part in it): "He was to abdicate his high office, retire to a monastery, and there await the judgment which would be pronounced by the Bishops."[76]

In the very first number of the new official journal of the Living Church, the *Viestnik of the Holy Synod,* we find an accusation against the Patriarch. This accusation asserted that the Patriarch was trying "to unite all the reactionary social forces, so as to instigate a new revolt."

The representatives of the Patriarch, Archbishop Illarion (Troitsky, former Professor of the Theological Academy),

---

[74] Regarding one of these conferences (at the end of September) we have detailed information from the Bishop of Perm (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 4, pp. 22-24).

[75] No. 244 (1981), 1923.

[76] This statement was sent abroad, for instance, to Metropolitan Antony (12/IX, 1923, No. 136). He answered it in a very sharp manner. See *Tzerk. Viedomosti,* 1923, No. 17-18, pp. 4, 5, and 12.

Archbishop of Tver, Seraphim, and Archbishop of Ural, Tikhon, clearly saw that no agreement with such individuals could be possible, and October 10th, informed Evdokim that they put an end to all negotiations.

On October 1, 1925, a deputation from three parishes of the Living Church visited the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Peter of Krutitzk.[77] Metropolitan Peter gave the following answer (This is testified to by the journal of the *Living Church*):[78] "The Sobor is no true Sobor; it is a false Sobor." Then he named the eight crimes of the "Renovated": The self-willed usurpation of authority; the fact of having elected the retired Bishop Antonin as its head; the expulsion of the Orthodox bishops by the H.C.A.; the institution of marriage for the bishops even prior to the Sobor of 1923; the illegal deprivation of the Patriarch of monastic orders and of his high office; the second marriages for priests; the perversion of the canons by the Sobor of 1923; the self-invented teaching which was upheld by the journal of the Living Church.

The Renovated also turned to Metropolitan Sergii, who had replaced Metropolitan Peter. They offered to make him the head of the Living Church; but, as we are informed by the *Viestnik* of the Holy Synod,[79] "he proved to be one of the most irreconcilable and answered that he would receive Vvedensky only, if the latter desired to make public confession of his sins."

In the same *Viestnik* Professor Titlinoff gives us a detailed description of the negotiations between the "Renovated" and the diocesan bishops.[80] The author does not spare reproaches

---

[77] Metropolitan Peter is the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See according to the expressed will of Patriarch Tikhon (7th January, 1925) and also according to the official document signed by sixty bishops (April 12, 1925, *Tzerk. Vied.*, 1925, No. 21-22, pp. 1-2).

[78] *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. —, p. 13. As regards the earlier attempts made to incline Metropolitan Peter more favourably towards the Living Church, see *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926.

[79] 1926, No. 5, p. 5.

[80] In the article, "What Has Been Done for the Peace of the Church?"

for the "obstinate Tikhonians"; but perhaps, quite involuntarily, the professor's habit of looking at things from a scientifically objective angle makes itself felt. His description makes us experience the same sensation which we used to have in childhood when reading the lives of saints, a feeling of rapture came over us before the radiant peace, firmness, and loyalty to their duty and to the head of the Orthodox Church and of the Orthodox clergy. And this they maintained even though they knew that a refusal to accept the schismatic authority would be followed by imprisonment, by exile to the far North in company with the worst criminals, or even by execution.

And yet the deep conviction that the Russian Orthodox Church will not perish is growing ever stronger and stronger. It will not perish, for the Spirit of God is with it; it will not perish, notwithstanding all the accusations and oppressions of the so-called Living Church.

Accusations and oppressions are quite as frequent during this new period of the Living Church. In this respect the resolution carried by the All-Ukrainian Sobor of the Living Church is very typical (Kharkoff, 17th May, 1925): "Soviet authority knows very well that a sincere and enlightened believer, so long as he keeps aloof from political schemes and is not hostile to Soviet authority, has the full possibility of receiving grace and being saved in the temples belonging to the Synod, which also stands aloof from politics and has no hidden stone to throw against authority." [81]

In short he who does not belong to the Living Church is a foe to Soviet authority. The practical deductions from this principle are made by the H. C. A.

Not a single official meeting of the Living Church can take place without similar accusations. Even the peaceable Sobor of 1925 was no exception. The address of the first congress of the Living Church declares in August 1922:

"Five years of civil war, the heavy sacrifices made by our fatherland, the dreadful economic crisis, millions of Russia's sons killed and maimed

[81] See *Golos Pravda Ukrainy,* Kharkoff, 1925, January, No. 1-2, p. 12.

during the war—all this is the fruit of the criminal treachery towards the Russian laboring people; a treachery of which the Orthodox Bishops were guilty when they sided with the people's foes. Our Bishops, headed by Patriarch Tikhon, preferred to keep gold, silver, and jewels in the Orthodox temples, and for this sake they falsified the canons, they sowed dissension among their flock, they called forth troubles, local revolts, and bloodshed."[82]

The Sobor of 1923 declares among other statements the following (May 3d):

"Beginning with the summer 1922 the responsible leaders of the Church definitely ranged themselves on the side of counter-revolution. The vital slogan of the Church grew to be the reëstablishment of the unity of Tzarist Russia. Patriarch Tikhon continues his counter-revolutionary activity. He is the leader and the banner of all the enemies of Soviet authority. He drags the Church into a counter-revolutionary struggle," etc., etc.[83]

The same accusing tone is to be heard in the address of the Sobor to the workmen and peasant government (1st October, 1925). Here the adherents of Tikhon are accused of attempting to use the Church as an anti-soviet force.[84] This accusation is most sharply expressed in the speech of Vvedensky, in which the Tikhonian bishops are accused of carrying on negotiations with England for the downfall of Soviet authority. The alleged insincerity of the Patriarch's acceptance of Soviet authority is proved by the fact that he is supposed to have sent (through Bishop Nicolas Solovey) his blessing to Cyril when the latter declared himself emperor.[85] Vvedensky's booklet, *The Church and Patriarch Tikhon,* is nothing but a carefully elaborated accusation of the Patriarch and of the members of the Petrograd Brotherhood—an accusation of crimes punishable by capital punishment according to Soviet legislation.

---

[82] Titlinoff, *The New Church,* p. 19. [83] *Pravda,* 1923, No. 98; Acts, p. 7.

[84] *Church Renovation,* November, 1925, No. 14, p. 111; *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 6, pp. 6-7.

[85] *Church Renovation,* pp. 112-116; *Viestnik,* pp. 9-10. The document to which Vvedensky referred in this instance was a clumsily faked one. See the above mentioned epistle from the Solovetz Islands, *Viestnik of the Chr. St. Mov.,* 1927, No. 7, p. 23.

In its official bulletins, May 15, 1927, the Viestnik, "a Living Churchman" writes: "The Tikhonian parishes make use of various and canonical organizations, such as the Committee of Mutual Aid or the Sisterhoods, etc., to form anti-soviet organizations *(sic)*, so as to be able to help the Koltchak army. They set afloat rumors about war; about a speedy restoration of former privileges," etc. (1927, Nos. 5-6, p. 4). In this respect the priests of the Living Church follow the directions of their leaders. The "Letter from Russia" (*Put*, 1926, No. 2, p. 4) tells us that the oppression exercised by authority over Orthodox priests is generally founded on the calumny of some priest of the Living Church, who wants to get for himself the place and the privileges of the man he accuses.

These are the open accusations made by the Living Church against the Orthodox. It is not difficult to imagine how many more "hidden" ones there are. These measures are adopted by the Living Church not only against the Orthodox, but also against sectarians, for instance against the Lipkovtzy. In this respect an article in the organ of the Ukrainian Living Church *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik* (1926, No. 1, pp. 7-8) is very characteristic. It tries to prove that the Lipkovtzy are only disguised followers of Petlura dressed up as priests.

And all such accusations do not remain without consequences. We have already mentioned the unsuccessful negotiations between the Living Church and the representatives of the Orthodox Church. Generally the refusal to accept the authority of the Synod is followed by measures of coercion. After the interruption of the negotiations, Patriarch Tikhon was summoned before the Narcomjust (Commissariat of Justice). Here he was told to abdicate from his high office. The Patriarch refused to do so and was, therefore temporarily, condemned to home arrest; it was forbidden to mention his name in public prayers, and the members of his Synod were arrested and exiled from Moscow.[86]

[86] *Tz. Vied.*, 1923, No. 19-20, p. 11; 1924, No. 1-2, p. 16. Compare No. 3-4, p. 11.

The *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See, Metropolitan Peter, refused to accept the Living Church, and was, therefore, arrested (23, xi, 1925), and notwithstanding his age and infirmities, first imprisoned for three weeks in the prison of the H.C.A., then for a long time in the Butyrka prison, and at last exiled to Siberia, at Tobolsk. About the same time eighteen other bishops and all the "Blagotchinnye" (Head priests) of Moscow were also arrested.[87]

The same fate overtook Metropolitan Sergii. After he had refused to accept the Living Church, December 3, 1926, he was arrested and set at liberty only in 1927.[88] During the period of his arrest the temporary *locum tenens* was Archbishop of Uglitch, Seraphim (Samolovitch).[89]

Of perhaps greater danger to the Orthodox Church than the hypocritical negotiations of peace and union accompanied by calumnies and oppression were the attempts made to bring discord into the midst of the Russian Orthodox Church itself. This was done by counting on the simplicity of certain bishops, poorly informed as to the real state of affairs. This was particularly easy in the case of those who had previously accepted the Living Church. There is no doubt that the All-Russian Temporary High Church Council (December 22, 1925) in Moscow was not established without the influence of the Living Church. This Church Council was headed by Archbishop Gregory and by the former Archbishop of Moguileff, Constantine, and by the Bishop of Mojaysk, Boris, the two latter belonging to the Living Church. The very fact that the *Narcomvnudiel* (Home Office) was eager to register this new institution as soon as possible proves the aim for which it was organized (January 2, 1926).

---

[87] *Tz. Vied.,* 1926, No. 5-6, p. 5; *Viestnik* of the H. S., p. 11, speaks in terms of great joy of his arrest (1926, No. 8-9, p. 17); *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1926, No. 5, p. 7; *Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 8, p. 26.

[88] Regarding this arrest, see *Tz. Vied.,* 1926, No. 23-24, p. 9. Regarding his liberation, the *Viestnik,* R. C. St. M., *Viestnik,* 1927, No. 7, p. 26.

[89] His epistle from 29/XII, 1926, published in the *Viestnik,* R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 3, pp. 28-29; his biography, *ibid.,* No. 7, p. 26.

The fact that Metropolitan Peter was under arrest and, therefore, poorly informed of the true state of affairs was made use of, and February 1st permission to form a committee of three archbishops was granted by him. This committee was to take over the duties of the *locum tenens*. However, the wisdom of Metropolitan Sergii made him see clearly through all these intrigues; and he condemned the leaders of this self-instituted High Church Council, and even forbade them to perform divine service. Another attempt to bring trouble into the administration of the Orthodox Church was made by the Living Church through Metropolitan Agathangel. April the 18th he declared that he was undertaking the administration of the Russian Orthodox Church as the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See. For a reason that is not quite clear, this was insisted upon by the representative of Soviet authority, a certain Tuchkoff. But Metropolitan Sergii declared that the time for which Metropolitan Agathangel had been invested with authority had passed. After some negotiations with Metropolitan Sergii, Metropolitan Agathangel withdrew all claims to authority.[90] Only the future will show whether the Living Church will succeed in sowing seeds of discord among the Orthodox; but it is quite clear that at present the High Church Council is acting in a spirit of loyalty to Patriarch Tikhon, and that it does not speak of any reforms. Still the Living Church is doing all in its power to profit by existing troubles.

---

[90] Regarding the new troubles, see details in the review of the *Tzerk. Vied.*, 1926, No. 5-6, p. 6; No. 9-10, pp. 5-7; No. 15-16, p. 18; No. 23-24, p. 9; also the *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 8-9, pp. 8-9, and No. 10, pp. 3, 12-13. *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1926, No. 5, pp. 7-8; No. 14, pp. 8-9; *Izviestia,* V. Z. I. K., 15, XI, 1925, and 9, II; 13, VI, 1926.

CHAPTER II

Foreign Policy of the Living Church

AFTER these details regarding the inner policy of the Living Church, we shall speak of its external policy; of the attempts it has made to usurp authority over the Russian Orthodox Church beyond the borders of Russia; of its relation to other Orthodox and non-Orthodox Churches.

Everywhere and constantly the Living Church is making attempts to subject to its authority the Russian Orthodox Church beyond the limits of Russia. We have already spoken of the epistle of the head of the Living Church, Evdokim, to the chairman of the Synod of the Russian Emigrant Church, Metropolitan Anthony. September 7, 1923, the same Evdokim sent a letter, which he entitles "an instruction" to Archbishop Evlogie, whom he chooses to name "Former Archbishop of Kharkoff and of Akhtyrsk."

"Hereby I inform you that by a resolution of the Synod, 24th August, I have been nominated administrator of the Orthodox Churches abroad; therefore I request you to prepare yourself to hand over to me all the affairs regarding the administration of the Orthodox Churches abroad, and that you make this known to such persons as it may concern." [91]

Evdokim sent similar instructions to all the priests of the Russian churches abroad, telling them to send him a report regarding the situation of the parishes entrusted to their care and a list of the valuables and estates of the churches. In case of their refusing to comply with his instruction, he threatened that he would take measures against them.[92]

---

[91] *Tz. Vied.*, 1923, No. 19-20, pp. 16-17. [92] *Op. cit.*, 1924, No. 5-6, p. 11.

And lastly, the same Evdokim wrote a letter to all the Russian bishops abroad, begging them to accept Soviet authority and the authority of the Living Church, "which has been legalized by the government on an international scale and is accepted by the Eastern Patriarchs." In exchange for such obedience, the Living Church promises to be their mediator before Soviet authority, and to try to persuade it to grant, both to the churches in Russia and to those abroad, their former privileges.[93]

Father Sergii Sokolovsky (residing in Paris) entered into negotiations with Evdokim. December 30, 1924, he was unfrocked by the Synod of Karlowitz. The Living Church then accepted him and Father Znosko (residing in Berlin) as its representatives. In France the Living Church has its own society, "The Supporters of Orthodoxy"; in Berlin it has founded a brotherhood.[94]

The Living Church also makes attempts to subject to its authority the Russian Churches in the West—America, and in the Far East—China.

In China the most active leader of the Living Church is Metropolitan Basil Smieloff. The Orthodox Archbishop Methodius of Harbin is successfully struggling against him and has published some booklets against the Living Church. In 1924 (May 31st), the Chinese Government accepted Soviet authority. This rendered the situation of the Orthodox Church much more precarious, and its struggle with the Living Church more difficult. And yet, thanks to the efforts of Archbishop Methodius of Harbin and of Innocent of Pekin, the Living Church has not been able to achieve any success here. Now the Living Church is trying to subject the Japanese mission to its influence.[95]

We have already spoken of the success in the United

---

[93] *Tzerk. Vied.*, 1924, No. 19-20, p. 17.

[94] *Idem.*, 1925, No. 1-2, pp. 2-4; *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 8-9, p. 15; No. 10, pp. 3 and 8; 1927, No. 2, p. 6; *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik*, 1926, No. 5, p. 9.

[95] *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 7-8, pp. 14-15; *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 10, p. 7.

States of America of John Kedrovsky, representative of the Living Church. This success can be explained not only by the energy of Kedrovsky, but also by the poor organization of the Orthodox Church Administration in America. Archbishop Alexander (Nemolovsky), who had been nominated to America by the Patriarch and the Synod, is absent and is replaced by Metropolitan Platon.

The Living Church also made attempts to subject to its authority the parishes of South America. A delegation headed by Bishop Nicolas (Solovei) of Kashi was sent to South America. But as soon as Nicolas reached Riga he broke his relationship with the Synod of the Living Church. On May 30th he wrote to Patriarch Tikhon expressing his repentance for his allegiance to the Living Church. He also wrote to the Synod of the Living Church, inviting it to repent and submit to the authority of Patriarch Tikhon. And, lastly, he wrote to the Russian Synod at Karlowitz.[96] The Synod gave the whole case over to the decision of its Sobor of October, 1924. This Sobor passed a resolution that Nicolas was to be received back into the fold of the Church, but as a simple layman; it did not accept the validity of his ordination as a bishop, because it had been performed by the Bishop Macarius of Piatigorsk and Bishop Alexander of Starobielsk. The reason which was given for not accepting his ordination as bishop was the fact that Nicolas had been elected by the Synod (*i.e.*, according to the Karlowitz Sobor, by the Synod of the Living Church).[97] But on December 5, 1922, no Synod of the Living Church had existed. It was founded in October, 1923. Therefore, it is quite possible that in this case the Sobor of Karlowitz was mistaken, being falsely informed. Bishop Nicolas did not submit to this decision, and informed Metropolitan Anthony of this in November, 1924. On arriving in Montevideo he founded there (January, 1925) the "Holy Synod of the Russian-Greco-Catholic Church"; and February 10, 1925, he in-

[96] *Tz. Vied.*, 1924, No. 13-14, p. 14; compare No. 15-16, p. 11.
[97] *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 7-8, pp. 16-18.

formed the Synod of Karlowitz that he was doing so with the consent of forty-eight Tikhonian bishops. Later, however, he again accepted the authority of the Synod of the Living Church.

When the Living Church was first founded, all the autocephalic churches of the Orthodox Church were decidedly hostile towards it, as towards a heretical and schismatic sect. On April 24, 1923, the Constantinople Synod and Council, headed by Patriarch Meletios IV, passed the following resolution: "We hereby decide to inform the Moscow representative of the Ecumenical Patriarch that the Great Church will not only send no representative to the tribunal (organized by the Sobor of the Living Church), but will also recommend other Russian priests and bishops to refrain from taking part in it; the whole Orthodox world looks upon the Patriarch of Moscow as upon a Confessor." [98] The All-Orthodox Congress in Constantinople calls the resolutions of the Sobor of the Living Church "uncanonical" (July 4, 1923, section 3244).[99] In his epistle of December 27th, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Gregory VII, calls the members of the Living Church "unlawful despoilers of Church authority in Russia," and Patriarch Tikhon the only lawful head of Church authority in the Russian Church.[100]

The Patriarch of Antioch, Gregory II, often expressed himself still more sharply against the Living Church. In his epistle of November 17, 1923, No. 1414, he calls the Synod of the Living Church "A Godless, Satanic Assembly," [101] and in another epistle (20/VI, 1925), he writes that "the only lawful supreme authority in Russia is that of the All-Russian Patriarch." [102]

The Jerusalem Patriarch, Damianos, writes in an epistle of July 27, 1925 (No. 828): "Patriarch Tikhon has been accepted by me and by all the Orthodox Patriarchs as the lawful canonical head of the Orthodox Russian Church; and as such we look upon him till the end of his earthly life." [103]

---

[98] *Tz. Vied.*, 1923, No. 7-8, p. 4.
[99] *Idem.*, No. 15-16, p. 4.
[100] *Idem.*, 1926, No. 1-2, p. 4.
[101] *Idem.*, 1923, No. 21-26, pp. 2-3.
[102] *Idem.*, 1925, No. 17-18, pp. 3-4.
[103] *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 17-18, p. 2.

No less positive and frequent were the assertions of the Serbian Patriarch, Dimitri. He said that "he always looked upon Patriarch Tikhon as the head of the Russian Orthodox Church." [104] "The Orthodox Church of the Greek kingdom can have no relations with the false Sobor entitling itself the Living Church and the High Church Administration," writes the Metropolitan of Athens, Chrysostomos, in an epistle of July 1st, 1923 (No. 1944).[105] The head of the Church of Cyprus, Archbishop Cyril, in an epistle to Metropolitan Anthony, (March 20, 1923), speaks of the innovations of the Living Church and declares "that never will the Church of Cyprus accept anything which goes counter to the canons." Also that it will accept as head of the Russian Church Patriarch Tikhon.[106] The Church of Poland was hostile towards the Living Church.[107]

However, within the last year we witness certain facts of another order. During the Sobor of 1925 Evdokim triumphantly declared in his speech: "That all the Ecumenical Patriarchs, Patriarchs by order of canonical succession, Gregory VII, Constantine VI, and lastly the present Patriarch Basil III, have entered into relations with the Holy Synod and uphold its efforts directed towards the protection of our (*i.e.*, the Living) Church." [108]

The journals of the Living Church published the letter of Patriarch Basil III to the Sobor of 1925[109] The Jerusalem Patriarch, Damianos, also corresponded with the Synod of the Living Church.[110] Some representatives of the Eastern Patriarchs assisted at the Sobors of 1923 and 1925. The Living

---

[104] *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 17-18, p. 2. The epistle of 9th/IX, 1924, No. 2354; for the address of the Living Church to Patriarch Dimitri see the *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 7, p. 3.

[105] *Tz. Vied.,* 1923, No. 13-14, p. 2. [106] *Tz. Vied.,* 1923, No. 9-10, p. 2.

[107] See the journal, *Voskzesnoye Tchtenie,* published in Warsaw (1925-28).

[108] *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 6, p. 15.

[109] For instance, *Tz. Vozrojdenie,* No. 14 (25/XI-1925; *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 6, p. 7; 1927, No. 2, p. 3.

[110] *Viestnik* of the H. S., No. 11; compare *Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, 1st Feb.; *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1/IX, 1926, No. 17, p. 2.

Church also succeeded in getting the Patriarch of Constantinople to take some measures against Patriarch Tikhon. In this respect Patriarch Gregory VII went very far (Nov. 17, 1924). During the Assembly of the Constantinople Synod (January 1, April 17 and 30, and May 6, 1924), a resolution was passed to send a "Church Committee" to Russia. In the instructions worked out for this Committee, Patriarch Gregory expressed the desire that Patriarch Tikhon "should sacrifice himself and immediately retire from the administration of the Church, for the sake of uniting those who had fallen away and for the sake of his flock; that, at least for the time being, the institution of the Patriarchate should be annulled, because this same institution had been established under conditions that were not normal at the beginning of civil war," and because it had proved to be one of the drawbacks, preventing the reestablishment of peace and unity.[111]

Similar desires were expressed by Gregory VII in his epistle of June 6, 1924. At the same time certain measures were taken against the Russian Orthodox Archbishops then residing in Constantinople, Anastasii of Kisheneff and Khotin and Alexander of North America. Both were summoned before a tribunal and forbidden to officiate or to make any demonstrations against Soviet authority. They were forbidden to pray publicly for Patriarch Tikhon; forbidden to accept the authority of the Synod of Karlowitz; and advised to accept that of the Bolsheviks.

Furthermore, Patriarch Gregory wrote to Patriarch Dimitri of Serbia asking him to close the Russian Synod of Archbishops in Karlowitz on the ground that this institution was self-elected and had no canonical foundations.

The actions of Patriarch Gregory evoked deep indignation among the Orthodox, both in Russia and abroad. Patriarch Tikhon wrote to Constantinople. In his letter he bases his position on the canons. He says that any attempts made by any

[111] See epistle of Patriarch Tikhon to Gregory VII, *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 7-8, pp. 2-4.

kind of Committee to establish relationships would not be accepted by the Russian people, unless such attempts were made through the mediation of himself, the only lawful and Orthodox High Priest of the Russian Orthodox Church. "Such an attempt would be conducive not to peace, but to greater trouble and schism." [112] The persecutions to which the Russian Bishops in Constantinople were subjected called forth a detailed epistle from the Karlowitz Synod to Patriarch Gregory;[113] also a series of articles in the *Tzerkovnye Viedomosti.*[114]

The other Churches did not approve of the actions of the Constantinople Patriarch. The Patriarch of Serbia refused to comply with the demand to close the Russian Synod of Karlowitz; looking upon such a demand as upon an infringement of the independence of the Serbian Patriarchate. Patriarch Gregory IV of Antioch declared the interference of Constantinople in the affairs of the Russian Church to be "quite inadmissible, very regrettable, and unfounded." [115]

But perhaps the fact that the Archbishop of Canterbury was displeased with the actions of Patriarch Gregory VII had an even greater influence on the latter, because the Patriarchate was very much in need of the protection of the Archbishop of Canterbury. In answer to the letter addressed to him by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Gregory said that he did not accept the Living Church and that he looked upon Patriarch Tikhon as upon the lawful representative of the Russian Church; that he had never thought of summoning him before a tribunal. As to the Committee which he was about to send, it was only organized to get information regarding the attitude of Patriarch Tikhon on many current Church questions. However, at present the Committee would probably not start for Russia.[116] (Actually, it never did start.)

Father Basil Dimopulos, who was the Moscow representa-

---

[112] *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 7-8, p. 3. [113] *Tz. Vied.*, 1924, No. 15-16, pp. 2-10.

[114] See, for instance, our article, "Dymnoe Nadmenie v Miru i Tzerkov."

[115] Epistle of June 20, 1925, *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 17-18, pp. 3-4.

[116] *Tz. Vied.*, 1924, No. 19-20, p. 17.

tive of Constantine VI, successor of Gregory VII, declared to one of the correspondents of the *Izviestia*[117] that the policy of Constantine regarding the Russian Church would be the continuation of the policy of his predecessors. Perhaps it was this declaration which called forth the "mournful," though severe epistle which Metropolitan Anthony sent him (February 17, 1925). In this epistle Metropolitan Anthony speaks of all the injustice towards the Russian Church which his predecessors had allowed themselves.[118] However, Patriarch Constantine had no time to reveal his true face, for very soon the Turkish authorities expelled him from Constantinople. His successor, the present Patriarch Basil III, refrained from any direct interference in the affairs of the Russian Church. In general, he acts in a more prudent manner and has taken up a neutral position in the dispute between the Living Church and the Tikhonian Church. When Metropolitan Anthony (March 30, 1926) wrote an epistle to the heads of the Orthodox Churches, protesting against an invitation to the Ecumenical Council being sent to the Living Church,[119] the Patriarch answered that as there were several Church parties in Russia and that as they all proclaimed themselves being veritably Orthodox Churches, he had invited to the Ecumenical Council not only the Living Church, but also the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See, Metropolitan Peter; that it was for the future Council to decide who was in the right in this Church dispute.[120]

In any case, there can be no doubt that the relation of some

---

[117] *Idem.*, 1925, No. 31. [118] *Idem.*, 1925, No. 11-12, pp. 1-4.

[119] *Idem.*, 1926, No. 7-8, pp. 2-3.

[120] This epistle (18/VII, 1926, No. 1413) has not been published. The question regarding the convocation of an Ecumenical Council was probably raised, because of the initiative of the Living Church, which offered to assemble in 1924 an Ecumenical Council in Russia (D'Herbigny, *Après la mort du Patriarch Tikhon,* Roma, 1925, p. 134). The Living Church insists upon this again somewhat later on (*Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 10, pp. 10-11). Here the epistle of the Holy Synod to the Ecumenical Patriarch Basil III is published (12th June, 1925, No. 2062). It is not difficult to understand why the members of the Living Church were so eager that a Sobor should be speedily assembled. Soviet authority would not allow the Russian Orthodox bishops to assist at the Sobor; it would be easy to come to an agreement with the Greeks and, as a result, the Ecumenical Council would, in reality, be a second edition of the Sobor of 1923.

of the Eastern Patriarchs to the Living Church is much more friendly now than it was formerly. However, we must not lay too much stress on this point. First of all, the members of the Living Church plainly pervert facts when they write that the Eastern Patriarchs have accepted the Living Church. For instance, they triumphantly publish the letter of Patriarch Basil to the Sobor of 1925.[121] But there is no objective cause for triumph. This is no acceptance of the Living Church, but only instructions addressed to it "that it should strictly fulfil the canons and strive to attain a complete and speedy settlement of the unfortunate schism." [122]

Therefore, the *locum tenens* of the Patriarch, Metropolitan Sergii, is quite right in pointing out in a letter of September 22, 1926, that the Eastern Patriarchs correspond with the Archbishop of Canterbury, with the Copts, and with the Armenians; that they do so in the most friendly terms; and that this in no wise proves that they consider them belonging to the Orthodox Church. On the other hand, if the Patriarchs really established union with the Living Church this would only denote that they themselves had ceased to be Orthodox, and not that the Living Church had become Orthodox.

The Patriarch of Constantinople sometimes makes a show of upholding the Living Church for purely political reasons; because he needs the aid of Soviet authority which protects the Living Church. The representatives and employees of the Patriarchate are sometimes simply bribed by Soviet agents, and they bring false information to the Patriarch. For instance, not long ago the Patriarch of Jerusalem explained his epistle to the Living Church by the false information which had been given him. In September, 1923, the chairman of the Constantinople Synod, Metropolitan of Caesarea, Nicolas,

[121] Cf. p. 337, note 109.

[122] Compare the two addresses of Basil to the Synod, November 11th and December 8th. In them he recommends to strive towards unity; he also tells them that the academies should be the treasure houses of the former theological academies, carrying out the commandments of these *former* academies in a spirit of Church *Orthodoxy*.

refuted the information of the paper *Nakanune (On the Eve)* (September 6, 1923), that the representatives of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jacob, and of the Patriarch of Alexandria, Paul, had accepted the Synod of the Living Church instead of Patriarch Tikhon.[123] The Patriarch of Antioch severely blamed his representative for having gone to the Synod of the Living Church.[124] During the plenary assembly of the Synod of the Living Church (April 16, 1926) the chairman thanked the representative of the Constantinople Patriarch, Father Basil, and frankly owned that the Holy Synod, on its side, was always willing to meet half way all the most pressing needs of the Constantinople Patriarchate. In other words, this meant *do ut facias*. The epistle of the Living Church (December 2, 1924) promises the autocephalous Churches "moral and material aid" from its bounties,[125] and the perquisition which was made in the Patriarchate during May, 1924, disclosed most interesting details. It appeared that the agent of the Living Church in Constantinople, a certain advocate, had been, since February 8, 1924, a secret employe of the Soviet consul in Constantinople, Potemkin; that he had received 800 Turkish lires a month; that one well-known employe of the Patriarchate also received (though not openly) 75 Turkish lires every month; the receipt of which he signed in the name of "Gerassimoff"; that the proposed plan of sending a delegation to Russia had been elaborated with the help of Potemkin; that as a recompense for this service the Patriarchate had been promised protection in Angora as regards certain privileges of the Patriarch; it was also promised that the Patriarchate should not be transferred from Constantinople.[126] However, in case the Turks should insist on the Patriarchate being removed

---

[123] *Tz. Vied.*, 1923, No. 19-20, p. 19.

[124] Compare epistle of the Living Church Synod to Meletios, Oct. 22, 1926, No. 3500; *Viestnik*, 1927, No. 1.

[125] *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 10, p. 2; *Tz. Vied.*, 1925, No. 5-6, p. 13. The original copy of the epistle (No. 4052) can be found in the Archives of the Serbian Patriarchate.

[126] The report of Rassim-Bey, May 28, 1925.

from Constantinople, Soviet authority invited Patriarch Constantine VI to come and reside in Russia. He was offered the city of Ekaterinodar, re-named Krasnodar by Soviet authority) as a residence.[127]

The acceptance of the Living Church by the Jerusalem Patriarch was also not from disinterested motives. On February 4, 1927, Patriarch Damianos wrote to the Synod of the Living Church asking for pecuniary aid, and the Synod consented to make an annual collection on the week preceding Palm Sunday in all the churches for the benefit of the Jerusalem Patriarchate (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, pp. 3 and 12).

Besides this, the Eastern Patriarchates are not a sufficiently important part of the Orthodox world to be able to decide the fate of the Russian Church. These Patriarchates are rather of archeological than of vital importance. All the four Patriarchates taken together are smaller than one Russian diocese; and the largest of them—Antioch—is decidedly against the Living Church.[128] The theory that these Patriarchs, and especially that of Constantinople, have a peculiar authority in the Church is completely false. The canons grant to the Constantinople Patriarch the first place only as an honorary title to the Bishop of the capital of the Byzantine Empire (Second Ecumenical Council; Third, Fourth Ecumenical Councils, 28; Sixth Ecumenical Council, 36). But at the present moment the Byzantine Empire does not exist, and the Turks have even changed the seat of the capital from Constantinople to Angora. Even during the time of the Byzantine Empire, the Patriarch of Constantinople was considered equal in authority to the other Patriarchs. And he was making an illegal use of his authority when he dominated over the others.

[127] D'Herbigny, *Après la mort du Patriarch Tikhon,* p. 134.

[128] *Viestnik* (1927, No. 4, p. 28) tries to assure its readers that "the fourth Patriarch (Antioch) has not declared himself a partisan of our (*i.e.,* of the Living Church) Orthodox Church only because the negotiations have been cut off. The Patriarch is living in Damascus, where the political situation is very troubled." However, the supposed "breach" in the negotiations did not prevent the Patriarch from declaring *urbi et orbi* that he looked upon the Living Church as upon a "Godless, Satanic Assembly" (see above).

This was possible only thanks to the close relations between the Patriarch of the capital and the Emperor.[129]

We must also note symptoms of a closer connection between the Living Church and the Church of Rome. At first the more honorable representatives of Rome were hostile towards it. On June 12, 1923, the famous Cardinal Mercier was authorized by the Pope to write to the English King and to the President of the United States of America the following words:

"It seems as if Soviet authority is preparing a new assault. The Sobor of 1923 of the Living Church has decidedly no right to speak in the name of the Orthodox Church. It has decided to deprive the most honorable Patriarch Tikhon of his high office. The only crime of the Patriarch is that he has remained faithful and true to his spiritual service as head of the Orthodox Russian Church. The aim of this godless decision is very clear. The members of the Sobor had to render it more easy for Soviet authority to pronounce the sentence of death against the leader who is surrounded by the reverential loyalty of all the people." [130]

Evdokim and Vvedensky both tried to establish some kind of contact with the Vatican, promising to be its mediators before Soviet authority, but evidently, at least in the beginning, their offers were repulsed.[131]

The tone in the recently published article, *Church Life in Moscow,* by D'Herbigny, President of the Papal Institute, is very different. It is most unpleasantly prejudiced. He tries his best to turn into ridicule and to degrade the Tikhonian Church; he assures us that its bishops are "ignorant, hard-hearted; that they denounce each other to the Bolsheviks; that they do not know how to preach, do not teach the catechism; and are only troubled as to the length of their beards and hair, upon which they look as upon something pleasing in the sight of God" (pp. 33, 36, 38. 40).

---

[129] See my article, "The Jurisdiction of the Constantinople Patriarch," in *Russkaya Mysl,* 1923, VI-VIII, p. 354-362; *Tz. Vied.,* 1923, No. 11-14, 17-18; and "Dymnoe Madmenie v Mira i Tzerkov," *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 17-24.

[130] See in the Russian Catholic Journal in Paris, *Faith and Fatherland,* No. 32-33, the article, "The Silence of Rome" (p. 235).

[131] *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 5-6, p. 11.

Some of the reproaches he hurls against the Church are exceedingly strange. He is very willing to repeat the calumnies of the Living Church against the *locum tenens,* Metropolitan Peter. For instance, he reproaches Metropolitan Peter for having abetted the expulsion of his rivals, Metropolitan Agathangel and Metropolitan Cyril of Kazan (p. 67). Whereas the truth is that both these, and later on Metropolitan Peter himself, were exiled because of the intrigues of the Living Church. In another place he reproaches Metropolitan Peter for having been "a petty red employe of the Ministry of Cults" at the time of Kerensky (p. 40), and later on he says that the Metropolitan had been a "senior employe of the Synod, a kind of civil general who knew all about Church business" (pp. 65-66). He reproaches Metropolitan Peter for not wanting to convoke a Sobor, only because he wanted, contrary to the canons of the Church, to retain authority in his own hands (p. 67); whereas before this the same D'Herbigny declared that it was not possible to assemble a Sobor as long as anti-Christian authority had not been expelled.[132] He also reproaches the Metropolitan for living in a villa which, he says, is too expensive (pp. 29-30), quite forgetting that at present it is not a villa, but a prison that is the usual residence of Metropolitan Peter and of many of the most honorable of the Russian Orthodox bishops. The words of a Bolshevist employe, who asserted that the members of the Living Church denounced the Tikhonians to the Bolsheviks, he twists in a manner to make it seem that the Tikhonians were denouncing their own brethren (pp. 41-42). The Patriarch is accused of having held negotiations with the Living Church regarding the convocation of the Sobor of 1923, and of afterwards having refused to give his consent, when he became aware that the majority might be against him. But, according to D'Herbigny, the Sobor was after all lawful, because the Patriarch of Con-

---

[132] *Après la mort du Patriarch Tikhon,* p. 93. For our critical article on D'Herbigny's book, *cf.* Serbian journal, *Lietopiss Matitze Srpske,* 1926, March, pp. 454-459.

stantinople sanctioned it (pp. 43-44). Yet before this, D'Herbigny himself tried to prove that the Patriarch of Constantinople had no right to interfere in the inner affairs of the Russian Church, and that at the present time he had lost all his former influence.[133]

D'Herbigny is still more hostile to the various sects which have separated from the Living Church, especially towards the so-called "Church Regeneration" of Bishop Antonin, of whom he repeats the words of the "First Church Dignitary of the Russian Church," Krasotkin, who said that Antonin "was a fool, a clown, a waistrel." Yet, in describing the Living (or, as he calls it, the Synod) Church, D'Herbigny finds only bright colors. He describes it even more optimistically than the Renovated themselves do (Professor Titlinoff, for instance). Thus the actual head of the Living Church, Vvedensky, who is of Jewish origin, and who is the agent of the Bolsheviks, and at whose door lies the moral responsibility for the death of Metropolitan Benjamin, and of many other Orthodox, is represented by the Jesuit D'Herbigny as the brave protector of Christian ideals from the onslaughts of the Bolsheviks, and as a man "quivering with love and faith" (p. 61). Is it surprising that the members of the Living Church were enchanted with the book of D'Herbigny? On April 16, 1926, Vvedensky reported to the Synod that D'Herbigny "had done immense service for the Holy Synod"; that he had come to Moscow with the express purpose of forging closer links with the Tikhonian Church, but had been attracted by the "Renovated." The journal of the Synod, *Viestnik,* triumphantly reproduces extracts from his book (*Viestnik,* 1926, No. 9, pp. 11-15).

How are we to explain such a blind Daltonism on the part of the Jesuit Father?

It may be possible that the book was written to permit him to visit Moscow a second time. This second visit actually took place. Before going to Moscow he was secretly ordained

---

[133] *L'Ame religieuse des Russes,* Roma, 1924, p. 60.

bishop, and during his stay he himself consecrated four new bishops in Moscow.[134] However, it may be possible that this book is only a stepping-stone for a new conquest of Russia by means of the Living Church. We have already seen that the Living Church has a decided tendency towards Rome. The position of the laymen, who are deprived of all rights, the fact that the Roman Catholic Church admits of the validity of the Living Church's episcopacy, forms a connecting link between the two. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic propaganda is only too well aware of the fact that the hierarchy of the Living Church is not backed by the people, and that this hierarchy would be much more likely to go over to the Roman Catholic Church than the "dry" and "hard" Orthodox bishops would. It is, however, somewhat doubtful if the Bolsheviks will permit this to take place. They know by experience how much trouble can be caused for them by such a powerful organization as the Roman Catholic Church, which is upheld by many political parties in various countries. They will, therefore, take care that the weapon which has been forged by them for the destruction of the Russian Church, should not fall into foreign hands.

---

[134] *Vozrojdenie,* 1927, III, I, No. 637; compare IV, II, No. 678, article of Prof. A. M. Volkonsky.

CHAPTER III

The Ideology and the Organization of the Living Church

HAVING given a short outline of the rise of the Living Church, we are now passing over to its ideology and organization.

Professor Titlinoff is one of its leading members. In his booklet, *The New Church,* he wants by all means to find some venerable ancestors for this still-born offspring. Therefore he counts among the predecessors of the Living Church the Slavophils, Dostoievsky, Tolstoy, Vladimir Solovieff, the Russian liberal members of the Sobor who had founded the "Religious-Philosophical Society" [1] in Petrograd.

But peacock's feathers do not generally suit the tail of a crow. What can there be in common between the national spirit of fellowship of the Slavophils and the priestly oligarchy of the Living Church? Dostoievsky would have been a stern denunciator of this assembly of "Rakitins" and of these petty inquisitors. And how contrary to Tolstoy, who taught that even the State had no right to employ force, is the teaching which not only sanctions for the past, the present, and the future, all the unprecedented oppression of the Bolsheviks, but builds all its Church life on the basis of this oppression; and which declares that before the Living Church began to exist, Christianity had been a failure, simply for the reason that it was not imperative enough; that it was incapable of "forcing" men to live in a Christian manner.[2]

---

[1] *The New Church,* pp. 41-50, Titlinoff. The same is repeated in the book of C. H. Marianovitch, *Jiva Zprkva u Russii,* Belgrad, 1926, pp. 26-28.

[2] *The New Church,* pp. 81-82.

What can there be in common between the burning upholder of the separation of the Church from the State, Vladimir Solovieff, who, as a consequence, even had a certain leaning towards Rome, and the Living Church, which is so ready to toady to an authority hostile towards all religion, that in its publications it often prints the name of God without a capital letter, whereas the words "Authority," "Government," are printed in capitals when they refer to Soviet authority. There is also no connection at all between the Living Church and the Religious-Philosophic Society. The spiritual leaders of this society, Metropolitan Sergii, D. S. Merejkovsky, N. A. Berdiaeff, S. N. Bulgakoff, A. V. Kartasheff, Z. Hippius, do not belong to the Living Church, but are, on the contrary, among its opponents. And the leaders of the Living Church were either not members of the Society or had no influence in it. The "Church Regeneration" of Bishop Antonin[3] has more right to declare itself influenced by that Society. However, the Church Regeneration has broken as completely with the Living Church as the Orthodox one has done.

In general we cannot look for the roots of the Living Church, for its vital nerve, in the realm of idealistic thought. They are to be found in practical class interests on one hand, and in the Bolshevik's change of policy towards the Church on the other. All the ideology of the Living Church is nothing but what Karl Marx calls "An Ideological Superstructure," which can be changed according to the practical interests of the moment. The Living Church is, first of all, "a revolt of the priests," or, if we like to use the language of the canons, "a Presbyterian Schism." It was created by the pride of the Petrograd clergy. The Petrograd priests, from olden times, have occupied a peculiarly privileged position in the Church. These Petrograd clergy were chosen from the most talented

---

[3] This is admitted even by Professor Titlinoff, who proves that Bishop Antonin and his Church Regeneration stand for a more idealistic teaching; whereas the Living Church follows practical and class lines (*The New Church,* pp. 15, 20, 25).

students of the Theological Academies. The wide circle of acquaintance of the Petrograd priests had grown to be proverbial. It actually began at the imperial court and spread to the leaders of the labor movement, the future conquerors of Russia.

The apartments of the Petrograd priests were objects of envy even to prominent statesmen. One of the priests, ridiculing his own brethren, was wont to say: "Never, even during confession, ask a Petrograd priest how much salary he receives, for this will become known only at the Last Judgement."[4]

"Be not afraid of court life, be not afraid of the nobles," such were the words with which the wise Metropolitan Philaret of Moscow sent his former vicar-bishop, now Metropolitan Issidor, of the Petrograd cathedral. "These have not much to do with the Church. But take heed of the Petrograd clergy —it is the guard regiment of the clergy." And now the guard regiment of the clergy had risen up in riot. In spite of the favored position of the Petrograd clergy, there was one dark spot. Similar to all the rest of the "White" clergy, *i.e.,* those who were not monks), these priests were subject to the authority of the bishops. Only a monk could be ordained bishop. Now very often it happened that the less talented among the students would take the cowl, and thus the path towards a bishopric became accessible for them. In consequence the desire to seize authority from the hands of the "Black" clergy was the chief reason which drove a group of the more ambitious priests to head a schism. Outward conditions explain easily enough why it was just in spring 1922, neither earlier nor later, that this revolt took on such wide proportions. Before that the Petrograd clergy had hoped to attain their aims in a legal manner, by means of a reorganization of the Church in a spirit of Christian fellowship. "But," complains Titlinoff, "these expectations were doomed to failure. The Sobor, which

---

[4] Father Vietvinitzky of the Udielny church.

was convoked in August, 1917, was very conservative, and its active members influenced it in a reactionary manner.[5]

But the point lies not in conservatism or in liberalism. All these ideas are of little importance for the appreciation of this Church phenomenon. The point is that the reformatory and ambitious longings of the "White" clergy could find no outlet. During the Sobor of 1917-18 the laymen acted in accordance with the bishops, and thanks to their aid, it became possible to reëstablish a Patriarchate, thus giving an official leader to the order of bishops. At the time of this Sobor the laymen were allowed to take a much more active part both in the diocesan and in the parish administration. Thus, if we look at the results obtained by the Sobor, not from the point of view of the whole Church, but from that of certain elements composing it, we must own that the interests of the "White" clergy lost more than they gained. It seemed as if all their ambitions were to be buried for a long time. The All-Russian Association of the Democratic Orthodox Clergy and of the Laymen, which had been formed at the beginning of the Revolution, was nearly silent. But suddenly in 1922 circumstances changed so much that it became possible to realize all their ambitions. Soviet authority veered sharply in its Church policy. A negative attitude was replaced by a positive one. In the beginning, Soviet authority thought to get the better of the Church only through propaganda of godlessness; by means of decrees, confiscations, prisons, exiles, executions. But in 1922 it saw clearly that all this was not sufficient; that open persecution of the Church only strengthened it. Therefore it decided to act neither by attacking nor by defending, but by bribing. Protection was promised to the ambitious priests of Petrograd, and this transformed them into obedient weapons for the destruc-

---

[5] *The New Church,* p. 48. Compare *Viestnik,* 1927, No. 4, article of Professor Titlinoff. The pages (21-71) of the article of A. Vvedensky, "The Church of Patriarch Tikhon," is full of profound hatred towards the Sobor of 1917-18. There is no doubt that the chief culprit of the schism of the Living Church was Vvedensky. See letter of Father I. Janson in the *Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., Aug. 1, 1926, pp. 7-8.

tion of the Church. This policy deserves the name of a "Religious Nep." [6]

This change of policy, which had been proposed by Trotzky, was decided upon in April, 1922, when the *Sovnarkom* assembled. It was decided to abolish the Patriarchate and to transfer the authority of the Church to an Assembly of the Faithful,[7] or, to be more exact, to those members of the clergy who should consent to act according to the dictates of authority. The ambitious members of the Petrograd clergy consented to this and began acting with great self-assurance and decision. They knew that Soviet authority, which was ready to go to any extremes, would always uphold them. During the first Congress of the Living Church in August, 1922, one of its leading members, Krasnitzky, openly declared that it was just the promise of being upheld by the Bolsheviks that had driven the members of the future Living Church to decisive action. Krasnitzky said: "The Government promised to change its Church policy in the spring. This met with great sympathy among us." [8]

In his booklet, Professor Titlinoff lets us see the same thing: "Only one thing remained for us to do: to acquire Church authority, if needs be given in a revolutionary manner. Outward circumstances made this solution easily possible, because the revolutionary Government, though itself alien to the Church, was willing to uphold this new activity of the Church. Thus the Church innovators crossed the "Rubicon." [9]

That such was the true genesis of the Living Church; that

---

[6] D'Herbigny quotes the words of the General Consul of the U. S. S. R. in Paris, Aussem, pronounced 29/IX, 1925: "In the same manner in which we have introduced a new economic policy, the Nep, we are now also carrying on a new religious policy. We have become convinced that millions, the majority of the Russian people, are deeply attached to their religion, and so we have decided to cease struggling against this religious tendency" (*Church Life in Moscow,* Paris, 1926, p. 13).

[7] See Telegr. of the Polish telegraph agency (12/V, 1922, *Black Book,* p. 157.

[8] *Krasnaya Gazeta,* 1922, VIII, 12, No. 181.

[9] *The New Church,* p. 54.

it was the fruit of a union of the godless Soviet Government with the ambition of unworthy representatives of the "White" clergy, is proved both by the confessions of the members of the Living Church and by the admission of Bolshevist authorities. The whole history and character of the Living Church corroborate this.

"A schism in the Church is of advantage for the Government of the workmen and peasants," writes one of the prominent Bolshevik propaganda agents in speaking of the Living Church, "because this weakens our foes and leads to the victory of Revolution. If the Church should ask the Soviet Government to help in its destruction, we should most willingly do so. If, on the contrary, it should ask us to help it to achieve greater unity, I believe it would find no response on our part." [10]

"We profit by the discord which exists among the clergy," writes another active anti-religious leader," so as to draw the people away from every kind of religion." [11]

The *Izviestia* of the V. Z. I. K. also writes: "The inner discord in the ranks of the clergy helped to bring about the first important cracks in the cunningly devised system of a religious crusade against Soviet authority. The organization of the Living Church and of other progressive groups of the clergy were a heavy blow for the Tikhonians." [12]

And lastly, the head of the Soviet Church policy, Tuchkoff, and the representative of its ideology, Bukharin, have often declared that the Living Church was created by the Government for the sake of destroying the Church "at the hands of the priests themselves."

In building up the Living Church, the Bolsheviks had yet

---

[10] J. Okuneff, *The Change of Landmarks in the Church (Smiena Viekh v Tzerkvi)*, Kharkoff, 1923, pp. 20-21; *cf., Biezbojnik*, No. 118.

[11] I. Stepanoff, *The Aims and Methods of Anti-religious Propaganda*, p. 28. Compare *Biezbojnik*, 6/VII, 1923.

[12] 1922, XII, 5, No. 275; compare *Pravda*, 7/V, 1922: "The confiscation of the valuables was a wedge which had to make a crack in the infirm body of the former state Church."

another aim. This aim was to raise the very low standards of their prestige in the sight of the civilized world. The Bolshevik journal *Biezbojnik* (The Atheist) writes very frankly regarding it (1923, V. 23) and cheerfully quotes the loyal declaration of the Sobor of 1923. It says: "Of course these decisions are of immense importance; from now on no one dares to say that the Soviet Government persecutes the Church, persecutes religion." The same journal (1923, V. 20, No. 22) publishes the letter of the High Soviet of the Living Church to the Archbishop of Canterbury of 12/V, 1923. From it we can judge that the hopes of the Soviet Government were not unfounded. In this letter it is said *expressis verbis* that at present "religious life has greater liberty in the Soviet Republic than it ever had under any government of our fatherland."

Titlinoff must decidedly pretend to be a simpleton when he finds it possible, notwithstanding all these cynically frank statements of Soviet leaders regarding the aims for which the Living Church was founded, to declare that a socialistic Government "being hostile to all religion, would be untrue to self, if it made use of any religion for its own aims." [13]

The organization of the Living Church is that of a priestly sect; however, it is not independent, but subjected to Soviet authority. Both the bishops and the laymen are of secondary importance in the Living Church. Authority lies in the hands of a group of priests. The group that organized the Living Church was composed exclusively of priests. Only later on were some bishops invited by this group to join the H. C. A. This was done from sheer necessity; only because (as has been frankly owned by the organ of the Living Church[14]) it was necessary to find some means of establishing the succession of bishops. The priests of Petrograd did not have the courage to ordain bishops as this was contrary to the canons. The so-called *Samosviatzy* of Kiev went the whole length.

But even the invited bishops were given only a secondary

---

[13] *Novaya Tzerkoff*, p. 34.

[14] 1922, No. 3, p. 10.

place in the organization of the Living Church, and only those bishops whose past was somewhat doubtful[15] were allowed to occupy prominent posts. This was due to the fact that these bishops would be afraid of having too much light thrown upon their past life, and would be rendered obedient by their fear. Yet even such do not always submit to the humble part allotted to them in the Living Church. For instance Bishop Antonin after his unsuccessful struggle against the priests of the Living Church forsook it (29, VI, 1923), explaining his action by saying that the Living Church was a priestly cast organization.[16]

The laymen were prevented from taking any part in the work of the Synod. This was done both by the first group of leaders and by the Central Committee, in whose hands all actual power remains to this day. During the first Conference of the Living Church Father Kryloff from Orel insisted during the Assembly of August 12, 1922, that a group of laymen should be included among the members, but the chairman of the Conference, Father Krasnitzky, forbade him to speak. Kryloff, in descending from the raised platform, made the following statement: "The movement called the Living Church is decidedly taking up a false position; in particular it is becoming first, a narrow class movement of the clergy alone, without the participation of laymen; second, it expects to be upheld by a system of economic and administrative measures, and wants all those who are of a contrary opinion to be exiled or to give their demission; third, in place of the one former high-procurator it has introduced fifty-six new ones in all the dioceses. These it names its representatives. Because of this and because most of the questions have evidently been decided

---

[15] Information relating to several of these ecclesiastics has been published in Russia. See also D'Herbigny in *Church Life in Moscow,* pp. 45-54, where it is stated that Antonin was forbidden by the Living Church to celebrate divine service, and this punishment was only repealed after his death. See also *Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, p. 3. Metropolitan Anthony sent a vigorous note of protest to Metropolitan Antonin, attacking Evdokim in both his official and his personal life.

[16] *Tz. Vied.,* No. 23-24, p. 16; compare he *Krasnaya Gazeta,* 1922, IX, 14.

beforehand, I consider it my duty to declare that I am no more a member of the Living Church." [17]

Not only this group itself, but also all the reforms undertaken by it, all the organs of its Church organization, wear a priestly character. Even the members of the Living Church admit as much. Professor Titlinoff writes: "In the realm of the inner problems of the Church the aim of the Living Church is *first of all* to free the life of the Church from monastic influence and to put the administration of Church affairs into the hands of the "White Clergy" . . . Its desire is to elect its bishops from the "White" not the "Black" clergy, giving precedence in ordaining as bishops married priests. However, it is not destined for the institution of bishops to play the same part in the Living Church as it had done formerly. The leading place in Church administration is given over to the priests; the bishops become only honorary representatives of the Church, not its masters.[18] The fundamental thesis of the new authority is firmly established. Authority has passed over from the hands of the bishops to those of the whole clergy, among whom the bishops have lost their preëminence. The priestly, not the episcopal, principle has been established.[19] The Living Church has carried out this principle from the very outset by giving most of the posts in all the ecclesiastical state organizations to priests.[20] This thought is expressed in one word by the Soviet *Izviestia,* which names the Living Church, "Priest Trust." [21]

Thus we see in all the organs of Church administration, in the center and in the dioceses as well as the parishes, a majority of priests. According to the resolution passed by the Conference of 1922, the H. C. A. had to be elected from among bishops, priests, and laymen. However, the bishops had to re-

---

[17] *Pravda,* 1922, VIII, 23, No. 188. Statistics also testify to the priestly character of the Living Church. *"Only thirteen bishops have joined it;* all the other bishops (117) have been ordained as such only after they had become members of the Living Church, thus receiving reward for their loyalty to it." See *Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 6, p. 16.

[18] *The New Church,* p. 12.

[19] *The New Church,* p. 39.

[20] *The New Church,* p. 31.

[21] 1922, XII, 3.

main in the minority.[22] The Conference did not stipulate that the laymen had also to remain in a minority, but in actual life they were almost quite excluded from the H.C.A. According to the resolution passed by the Sobor of 1923, the High Church Council (which had replaced the H. C. A.) was to consist of five bishops, twelve priests, and only one layman.[23] The Synod which was established by the Conference of 1923 consisted of twelve bishops and twenty priests and laymen. The number of laymen was not fixed, but here, too, they were a negligible minority.

As regards the diocesan administration, the Conference of 1923 decided that it should consist of one bishop, one layman and four priests. The bishop was to be chairman, but no other privileges were granted to him. Therefore the majority of the priests always carried the day, and it was only when bitter necessity (*i. e.*, the fear of utter failure) forced it, that the Living Church gave, during the Sobor of 1925, somewhat more prominence to the laymen in the high and diocesan Church Administration.

Even in parish administration the laymen play no important part. "The Living Church," admits Professor Titlinoff, "seems to suspect laymen and to be afraid of their influence in Church affairs."[24]

In the parish councils it would have been actually impossible to form a majority of priests, and therefore the Living Church is hostile to these councils and has curtailed their rights. It has already been mentioned that the very first conference adopted a series of measures against the parish councils; it arranged so that only those laymen who carried out in life the principles of the Living Church should be allowed to enjoy full privileges and rights. We must not forget that the fundamental principle of the Living Church is the unlimited domi-

---

[22] Titlinoff, *The New Church,* p. 17.

[23] *Pravda,* 1923, VIII, No. 101; Acts, p. 14. This solitary layman was a certain Novikoff (or, to be more exact, a Jew, Eisenstein, an agent of the Soviet authority).

[24] Titlinoff, *The New Church,* p. 13.

nation of the "White" clergy. Therefore only those who accept this domination and give up all personal rights in the Church will enjoy full privileges and rights. In the newly drafted parish statutes of the Living Church, the laymen are again given a very secondary place. During the Assembly of the plenum of the Synod (16/IV, 1926), Vvedensky said that the "fundamental idea of the parish statutes was to liberate the priests from the oppression of the laymen; that the statutes actually gave the priests a position in which the pastor could be the true leader of the parish" (*Viestnik,* 1926, No. 1, Op. 2).

It is true that very many bishops and laymen assisted at the Sobor of the Living Church. But we have already seen that only those individuals who curried favor with the leading group of the clergy were admitted; and secondly, that the importance of the Sobors had been reduced nearly to zero by the Living Church. First of all the name of "Sobor" is quite unsuitable for these gatherings of the Living Church. In all Orthodox Sobors, only bishops had the right to vote, though priests and laymen could be members of them. All resolutions passed became valid only after they had been sanctioned by a committee consisting of bishops alone. The Living Church set aside this order of things in its very first Sobor, and abolished the Committee of Bishops. Therefore D'Herbigny, who is very well disposed towards the Living Church, is quite right when he says that it would be much more just and simple to name the Sobors of the Living Church "National Congresses." [25]

These Sobors are quite devoid of freedom. All resolutions are pre-decided in the official organs of the high administration which successively replace each other: the H. C. A., the High Church Council, and lastly the Synod and the unofficial, but all the more influential, Central Committee of the Living Church. These organs not only pre-decide the resolutions, which are to be passed during the Sobor, but also modify and annul them

[25] D'Herbigny, *Church Life in Moscow,* p. 69.

either in administrative orders, or else during the conferences which are organized by them. For instance, the Conference of 1923 abolished the High Church Council, which had been established that very same year by the Sobor; and introduced instead of it the Synod. In fact the Central Committee, which is composed exclusively of priests, and in whose hands all real power is centered, needs these Sobors only for preserving the semblance of Christian fellowship in the Church administration, thus throwing sand into the eyes of foreign public opinion. The diocesan collegiate organs have also very little influence. They are completely subjected to the diocesan representatives, who are the agents of the Central Committee. On the whole the organization of the Living Church is rather an exact copy of the order established in other branches of the administration.[26] Here, too, the Soviet (council) principle is needed only as a decoration. Actual authority is in the hands of a small group of individuals.

However, though the Central Committee has unlimited authority in the Church itself it is, in its turn, subjected to Soviet authority, and is nothing but the obedient instrument of the latter.

In the G. P. U., which is the successor of the Cheka (Government Political Administration) there exists a special secret section devoted to religious questions. This section is headed by Tuchkoff (or Tuchka), and it is here that the members of the Central Committee of the Living Church, Vvedensky, Krasnitzky, Evdokim, and others, come for instructions. And it is here also that the most important measures against the Orthodox Church are decided.[27]

---

[26] See the interesting and well-written comparison between the first days of the Bolshevik régime and the first steps of the Living Church (*Pravda,* 1922, VIII, 15).

[27] See *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 13-14. Compare *Rul,* 1922, XI, 21, No. 577. Therefore the Epistle from the Solovetzky Islands is quite exact when it names the Living Church a "State Church," to which the Soviet Authority gives a protection which is contrary to the laws it has issued itself. This protection is given only when it can be turned to the detriment of the Orthodox Church (*Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 7, p. 22).

The presbyterian or priestly character of the Living Church explains not only the secondary place given to the bishops, the nearly complete setting aside of all laymen, but also its other reforms, viz.: the abolition of the Patriarchate, the admission of marriage for bishops, and of second marriages for priests, the establishment of a fixed tariff for the performance of religious rites, and even—partly—the change of attitude towards Soviet authority.

The Sobor of 1923 passed the resolution that the Patriarchate should be abolished not only because this was the desire of Soviet authority, but also because the Patriarch stood at the head of the bishops; and because he united and strengthened them; and thus hindered the fulfillment of priestly ambitions. The journals of the Living Church prove that this step was not a question of principle. The pages of these journals are as full of blame for the Patriarchate in Russia, which goes counter to the desires of the Living Church, as they are full of praise for the Eastern Patriarchates with which the members of the Living Church are seeking to curry favor.[28] Vvedensky demands that when the names of the Patriarchs are mentioned during Divine service, the word "Eastern" should be added, "because we have abolished the institution of Patriarch for ever" (Report during the meeting of the plenum of the Synod 22/X-1927, *Viestnik,* 1928, No. 1, p. 13).

The Living Church not only introduced marriage for the bishops, thereby paving the way for the priests to the highest ecclesiastical dignities,[29] but even went a step further than the

[28] *Cf., Golos Pravoslavny Ukrainy,* 1925, No. 1-2, pp. 15-16.

[29] D'Herbigny explains the permission of marriage for the bishops by the personal interests of the priest Vvedensky: "So as to render his (*i.e.,* the married Vvedensky's) ordination as bishop valid and not anti-canonical, the delegate of Siberia insisted that the canons should be changed during the Sobor of 1923" (*Church Life in Moscow,* p. 23). The address of Peter Blinoff, the Metropolitan of the Living Church in Siberia, to the Far-East clergy, is very characteristic (12/I, 1923, No. 58): "You must elect to the dignity of bishops worthy candidates from among the married priests." By January 1, 1927, forty-four out of the 140 bishops were married (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 22, p. 6).

Soviet authority had done. This measure was actuated by a spirit of malice towards their former more fortunate rivals. As soon as the Living Church was founded it immediately began to wage war against the monastic institution; orders which, according to the words of an ancient Church chronicle, were the "blossoms on the tree of the Church," and which even Protestants are beginning to appreciate.[30] In the words of Professor Titlinoff, the Living Church "doomed the whole institution of monasticism to destruction."

The same author says that "the Conference of 1922 insisted that all the city monasteries should be closed and transformed into parish temples. The village monasteries were to be turned into 'Labor Brotherhoods,' and their statutes made similar to those of agricultural communities and industrial cooperatives." In short, all monasteries, as such, were to be closed. During the Assembly of May 4, 1923, the Sobor declared that "All monasteries were to be closed, because they had deviated from the pure monastic idea." [31] Later on a decree of Soviet Authority demanded that all monasteries should be closed by January 1, 1925.[32] Vvedensky declared that "monasticism had become obsolete" (Report to the Synod, 22/XI, 1927, *Viestnik,* 1923, No. 1, p. 15).

The fact that the Living Church permitted second marriage for the priests must also be explained as a measure furthering the interests of the "White" clergy. The Orthodox Church forbade second marriages for the priests; this prohibition being founded on the words of the scripture. Through all the nineteen centuries of its historic existence, the Ortho-

[30] In this respect the investigations made by W. H. Maclean, *Christian Monasticism in Egypt, 1920,* are very interesting. They prove that the theory which declares monasticism to be the outcome of alien influences in Christianity is false. Monasticism is the natural fruit of Christian teaching.

[31] Acts of the Second All-Russian Local Sobor, p. 11; regarding the destruction of the monasteries in Moscow, see D'Herbigny, *Church Life in Moscow,* pp. 20-21.

[32] *Tz. Vied.,* 1925, No. 3-4, p. 8. Also the lecture of Krassotin published in the *Viestnik* (1928, No. 1, pp. 27-30). In this lecture, in a most ignorant manner, he defends second marriages for the clergy.

dox Church had always and everywhere kept to this rule.[33]

Neither did the reformers forget their own material interests.

From the very outset of the Living Church a rather high tariff for the performance of religious rites was established. This was one of the reasons for which the so-called Church Regeneration separated from the Living Church. This sect protested against "compulsory taxation for the needs of the cult" which had been introduced by the "narrow professional and exclusively class Living Church."[34] This also gave food for the attacks against the Church made by atheistic propaganda. One of the Soviet propaganda agents writes: "The Living Church declared that it was about to restore Ancient Christianity going back to a time when the priests performed all religious rites without demanding any fees. But the interests of the belly have forced the Living Church not only to introduce payment for all such rites, but to discover canons authorizing it to do so."[35]

And lastly, the unquestioning acceptance of Soviet Authority which is "using state methods to establish the Kingdom of God on earth," in the revolutionary phraseology adopted by the Living Church. All these are among the measures to attain their chief aim, the supremacy of the "White" clergy. Of course we do not deny that there exist within the Living Church some elements, which hoped that by accepting Soviet Authority they would be able to improve the unbearably hard situation of the Orthodox Church in Russia.[36] But the leading

[33] Regarding this, see my book, *Second Marriages for the Clergy,* St. Petersburg, 1923, and the article, "The Dogmatic Meaning of the Prohibition of Second Marriages for the Clergy," *Tz. Vied.,* 1923, No. 13-16.

[34] Titlinoff, *The New Church,* p. 23.

[35] J. Okuneff, *Smiena Viekh v Tzerkvi* (The Change of Policy in the Church), Kharkoff, 1923, p. 20. The petition of the presidium of the Living Church to the organs of state authority is also very characteristic. This petition asks that the clergy of the Living Church should be granted all kinds of material privileges, because of its proved loyalty to civil authority (*Viestnik* of the H. S., 1927, No. 2, p. 13).

[36] Such must have been the motives which caused the Bishop of Petrograd, Artemii, to pass over to the Living Church. Later on he returned to the Ortho-

groups of the Living Church were not actuated by these erroneous[37] though still ideological motives. They simply were furthering their own personal and class interests. Titlinoff writes: "The Living Church is always laying stress on its solidarity, using the slogans of the socialistic liberty-bringing movement." Titlinoff thinks that it has "tactical reasons" for doing so.[38] The Living Church has usurped authority counter to the canons, counter to the expressed will of the bishops and of the people; it is torn asunder by discords. Its leaders understand all too well that they can retain and enlarge their authority only with the aid of the Bolsheviks; and, therefore, they are ready to make any sacrifices in order to remain in the good graces of the latter. But the past records of these leaders make us doubt the high quality of their revolutionary ardor. Documents made known during the trial of Benjamin (Kazansky), Metropolitan of Petrograd, have proved that Krasnitzky had been a member of the "Association of the Russian People";* that he had written articles about the Jews drinking Christian blood; and that he had tried to instigate a revolt against the Bolsheviks.[39] Vvedensky had formerly been a teacher; during the war he became a regimental priest and used to deliver sermons in a highly patriotic and militant strain. He was intimate with Metropolitan Benjamin, who was

---

dox Church. In the letter written before his execution, Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd says: "How strange is the reasoning of some (I am thinking of Platonoff) that we must try to preserve all living forces, *i.e.,* consent to compromise our conscience for the sake of doing so. If that were the case, what would be the use of Christ? The point of view from which they speak would mean destruction for the Church" (*Tz. Vied.,* 1926, No. 3-4, p. 7). At present Platonoff is Archbishop of the Living Church.

[37] These motives are erroneous, because the Living Church will enjoy the protection of Soviet Authority only as long as it will be necessary to the latter as an instrument of destruction against the Orthodox Church. If the Living Church should succeed in replacing the Orthodox Church, it would, in its stead, be persecuted.

[38] *The New Church,* p. 14.

* Footnote of Translator—One of the most retrograde monarchical associations.

[39] *The Black Book (Tchernaya Kniga),* p. 223; compare *Golos Rossii,* 1922, X, 4, No. 1075.

executed by the Bolsheviks. During the first days of Bolshevik domination, when everybody thought it would be of short duration, he delivered very sharp sermons against it. One of these sermons I myself heard in a church near the station of Tzarskoe Sielo. Boyarsky and Bidlkoff were also intimate with the executed Metropolitan Benjamin.[40] The "Psalomshchiki" (Psalm-reader) Stadnik and Stadnikoff, who took part in the deputation sent to the Patriarch, had been man-servants in the household of the Grandduchess Xenia Alexandrovna, and had been noted for the toadying, servile spirit, so common among lackies.[41] Is there not something strange in the fact that all these well-intentioned members of the clergy should suddenly have felt themselves so revolutionary, just at the time when it grew possible, with the aid of the Bolsheviks, to usurp authority in the Church?

The Bolsheviks themselves understand very well that this metamorphosis is somewhat suspicious. Therefore they mistrust and deeply despise the newly converted communists.

One of the leading communists in the Far East has said: "They prostrate themselves before us; they express their most humble sentiments of loyalty; but when the critical moment will come, they will be the first to be false to the authority before which they are now grovelling. Therefore this authority repays their servility by despising their services." [42] "Where have they (the leaders of the Living Church) been during these five years?" asks the *Biezbojnik*. "They passed over into our camp only when it grew clear that the Bolsheviks had conquered." [43]

A Soviet propaganda agent writes: "The Living Church has declared that from now on it is going to struggle against capitalists and oppressors; that it is ranking its forces with the laboring; that it is on the side of revolutionary authority;

---

[40] Titlinoff, *op. cit.*, p. 62; compare *Tz. Vied.*, 1924, No. 1-2, p. 15.

[41] *Poslednie Novosti*, 1922, XI, 28, No. 800. (Report of A. V. Kartasheff.)

[42] Archbishop Methodius, *The Living Church*, Harbin, 1926, p. 83.

[43] Article by Goreff, *How and Wherefore Did the Living Church Appear?* 1923, VII, 29.

on the side of the workmen and of the peasants. Fine words! The declarations issued by it are so beautiful that really some of the less experienced workmen may believe that communists have donned priestly robes and are preaching communism from the church pulpit. But how is it that the counter-revolutionists of yesterday are publishing such revolutionary declarations today? It seems to me that this revolutionary dye has been adopted to save their own skins and their material interests." [44]

And so we see that the ambition of some of the usurpers of authority and the class interest of the priestly caste have proved to be the axis round which the life and the activity of the Living Church are turning. All else is of importance to it only in so far as it strengthens this axis; and, therefore, it is constantly modified according to the demands of the moment. The members of the Living Church go back upon their own most important reforms, change their most central institutions, change even the name of their organization. They have no objection to changing their masters. But in all these changes they remain true to themselves and to the priestly class interests which they are serving.

---

[44] J. Okuneff, *A Change of Policy in the Church (Smiena Viekh v Tzerkvi)*, pp. 20-21.

CHAPTER IV

The Living Church Before the Tribunal of the People's Conscience and the Teaching of the Orthodox Church

ACCORDING to the expression of an epistle of the Eastern Patriarchs (May 6, 1848), the Orthodox people are "the true stewards of piety and the true Body of the Church." This people has already pronounced its severe yet just sentence against the Living Church. Notwithstanding the most insistent invitations and even compulsion, it wants to know nothing of it, and flies away from it as from a pest-infected place. Thus the prophecy of Christ "that the sheep did not hear them" is coming true for these self-elected pastors.

Let us again allow facts and the members of the Living Church themselves to speak about it.

"The initial sin of the new Church movement is its aloofness from the mass of the faithful," admits Professor Titlinoff. Notwithstanding all the assurances it has made about the "laboring flock," the Living Church has not succeeded in drawing the lay elements into the sphere of its influence.[1] The mass of the faithful were still further alienated from the new Church movement by such measures as the abolition of those Church soviets which were not favorable to the Living Church and the reëlection of soviets composed of members having received special recommendations; by the fact that only such laymen as were friendly to the Living Church were granted

[1] D'Herbigny testifies to the same thing, *Church Life in Moscow,* pp. 40 and 67.

all the rights of Orthodox citizens; that no important part was given to any layman in the new Church administration. All this rendered the position of the Living Church quite unstable.[2] One of the priests of the Living Church, Father Larin, writes in the official organ of the Living Church: "The fundamental reason for the gradual decay of the new movement, a decay which is especially visible in the villages, consists in the fact that the people are very positively hostile to it; all the people simply ignore the Renovated priests, and as a result these latter, who are mostly family men, remain for six months at a time without employment, whereas there exist many vacancies." [3]

In the official journal of the Living Church, the *Viestnik of the Holy Synod,* Titlinoff publishes an article: "What has been done for the Christian World?" Here it is said that "the active members of the Synod have tried to influence the people by means of talks, addresses, etc.; but it has all been in vain, for the people have not followed their leaders." [4]

The same impression was received by a foreigner visiting Russia, namely, by the Methodist Bishop, James Cannon.* He writes: "The Living Church has fallen to pieces, notwithstanding the fact that Soviet authority has done all in its power to uphold it. For the Russian people have almost unanimously remained faithful to the Church of the Patriarch. The representatives of the Living Church and its few followers are seeking for a means of returning to the fold of the true Church." [5] Even the advocate of the Living Church, D'Herbigny, has been forced to admit "that in Moscow especially, the majority of the faithful go to the Tikhonian churches; that the Living Church priests remain without parishes and without bread;[6]

---

[2] *The New Church,* p. 2; compare *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 7, p. 5.

[3] *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1927, No. 11.

[4] *Idem.*, 1926, No. 7.

* Bishop Cannon is a Bishop of the Methodist Church, South.

[5] New York *Times,* 27th September, 1926; compare *Vozrojdenie,* 1926, X. 18, No. 503.

[6] *Church Life in Moscow,* pp. 40-41.

and that even the members of the Living Church admit that the majority of the people are on the side of the Tikhonians.[7] Therefore Patriarch Tikhon was quite right when he said to the correspondent of the *Information:* "The leaders of the new Church are generals without an army."[8]

The members of the Living Church often give us exact figures as to the number of their bishops and priests, but they are very silent as to the number of laymen belonging to it. If they do sometimes assert that one quarter of the Orthodox population[9] belongs to it, they can do so only by reckoning among its followers the laymen of all those parishes in which the Orthodox priests have been expelled by force. And yet in those very parishes which they assure us belong to the Living Church, they cannot find even twenty persons who are the requisite number for being registered as a "cult group" (Instructions of the Commissariat of Justice, 24th August, 1918). Consequently they are making attempts to replace the "cult groups" by an institution consisting of only two or three representatives.[10]

The number of the adherents of the Living Church diminished very quickly after the Sobor of 1925, when all hope of reunion with the Orthodox Church had to be abandoned. The Assembly of the plenum of the Synod admitted as much officially (April 16, 1926, *Viestnik of the Holy Synod,* 1926, No. 10, p. 3). According to the statistics of the Living Church itself, there were 108 dioceses, 192 bishops, 12,593 parishes, and 16,540 members of the clergy belonging to it October 1, 1925 (*Viestnik,* 1926, No. 7, p. 2). Whereas January 1, 1927, it could boast only of 84 dioceses, 140 bishops, 6,245 parishes, and 10,815 members of the clergy (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, pp. 9 and 17). The *Viestnik* tries to console its readers by saying

---

[7] *Op. cit.,* p. 67. [8] *L'Information,* 1924, No. 219.

[9] D'Herbigny, *op. cit.,* p. 67; however, Father Liubomir Iovanovitch (a Serb), returning from Russia in 1924, fixes the number of all the sectarian priests in Russia only at 14%. *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 19-20, p. 14.

[10] *Sunday Reading (Voskresnoye Tchtenie),* 1926, XI, 14, No. 46; *Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, No. 10, pp. 2 and 7 (8).

that the first figures were exaggerated (what a valuable confession!) and that the new ones are more in accordance with actual facts (though still at great variance from the truth). What guaranty have we that the new figures are not also exaggerated?

The following figures prove eloquently the degree of sympathy which the members of the Living Church actually take in its true interests. In 1926, all the dioceses together sent a sum of 4,015 roubles to the treasury of the Holy Synod; and during three months only 530 roubles were collected for the Educational Fund (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, p. 9).[11] The number of the adherents of the Living Church in some of the dioceses (Nijny, Tver) is not over 1.5 per cent. This is a figure which we take from the statistics of the Living Church. Generally it is only in out-of-the-way regions that the activity of the Living Church is successful. This is the case, because the population there is badly informed and often mistakes the Living Church for the Orthodox one. The figures we have taken include the Ukraine and Bielorussia. But only 36 dioceses and 3,341 parishes stand under the direct jurisdiction of the Moscow Synod, *i.e.,* 16.6 per cent of all the Orthodox parishes (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 2, p. 17). The situation of the Living Church is no better in the Ukraine. An article by Father Koreneff entitled "From the Records of the Heart" is very characteristic. The author asks in despair: "Will there be no flock for us pastors to lead? Will there be anybody left for us leaders to administer?" He invites the Tikhonians to accept terms of peace (*Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1927, No. 1, p. 14; compare 1926, No. 19, p. 3; compare also *Viestnik* of the Russ. St. Christ. Movement, 1927, No. 6, pp. 23-24).The faithful not only do not go to the Living Church, but are openly hostile towards it. Even the members of the Living Church themselves are forced to admit this.

In the booklet of Professor Titlinoff we read: "The great

[11] August 15, 1927, P. Krasotkin asked even the American delegation to give material aid to the Living Church (*Viestnik,* 1927, No. 9-10, p. 25).

majority of the clergy and of the parishes did not want to accept the new Church Administration. The names of the leaders of this movement grew to be odious. The excitement among the masses of the Church members was so great that some of the leaders of the movement stood in danger of physical violence. A stone was thrown at the head of Father A. I. Vvedensky. Others also have been threatened with stones or with having other missiles thrown at them. But the militia took them under its protection. The bishops and priests of the Living Church were not able to perform divine service or to show themselves in the temples or in the streets without being molested. Reproaches and even curses were hurled at them. Among the unenlightened masses rumors of Antichrist's appearing began to be frequent. The old women of Petrograd asserted that Vvedensky's motor-car had the "Beast's" number (the stamp of Antichrist), only turned upside down (999).[12] The hostility manifested by part of the audience during the public discussions of the Living Church was really quite striking.[13]

In addition to the words of Titlinoff we must mention the fact of the thrashing V. D. Krasnitzky received in the Church of Our Saviour in Moscow. The Living Church had organized a meeting there. Only the interference of the militia stopped the onslaught. Krasnitzky was carried away senseless.[14] In Tzaritzyn the diocesan representative of the Living Church, Serebriakoff, was thrashed by the workmen. In Pultava the bishop of the Living Church, Theodosius, was also beaten by the people. In Odessa the people expelled the bishop from his church.[15]

Still more terrible was the incident which took place in Jaroslav. Here Evdokimoff, a communist and a priest of the

[12] Up to a certain point they were right, for the motor-car of Vvedensky was given to him, if not by an institution of Antichrist, at all events by an anti-Christian institution; it came from the "Section of Cults" of the G. P. U. (*Rul,* 1922, XI, 21, No. 577). As regards the activity of Vvedensky in the *Tche-Ka,* see the information given by Souvorin, *Vozrojdenie,* 1927, IV, 11, No. 678.

[13] *The New Church,* p. 51; compare 24.

[14] *Tz. Vied.,* 1923, No. 19-20, p. 9.

[15] *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 19-20, p. 16; *Biezbojnik,* 1923, IX, 9, No. 38.

Living Church, was killed in September, 1922. In the pocket of his coat a letter was found with the words: "The first warning to those who want to transform the Church into a communistic group." [16] We cite only a few of the incidents about which we have received information, notwithstanding the Chinese wall with which Russia is separated from the rest of the world. . . .

Of course, in real life the canons are not like Nature's laws, which know no exceptions. Canons are rules laid down by the High Church Authorities; but they are often violated, because of sinfulness, human frailty, or ignorance. But just because of this, one infringement of a canon can in no wise justify another violation of it, just as any other violation of the law cannot serve as a justification for a second infringement of it. How much less, then, can only supposed violations of the canons justify the Living Church? Professor Titlinoff could point only to one precedent in favor of the Living Church, namely, the Church reform of Peter the Great. But it remains very doubtful whether this reform, as accepted by the whole Orthodox Church, was actually anti-canonical. The usual reference to the fact that the reform of Peter the Great was made under the influence of his acquaintance with the organization of the Protestant Church Administration is not to the point, because the Protestants tried in their reforms to revive the ancient Church order, which had been violated by the Pope's ambition. Titlinoff himself assures us that the Church in accepting the reform of Peter was guided by its desire for the welfare of the Church. Can this be said of the Living Church, which is thinking only of the greedy class interests of the White Clergy; which is the obedient instrument in the hands of a godless authority; an instrument used not for the upbuilding, but for the destruction of the Church? It were

---

[16] *Rul,* XI, 15, No. 572. Compare the diary of Vvedensky, in which he speaks of the numerous cases of physical onslaughts against the members of the Living Church. He proposes to fight against the Tikhonians as against bandits; *i.e.,* to execute them without trial (*Viestnik* of the H. S., 1926, December).

childishly simple to imagine that the anti-canonical reforms of the Living Church could in any way render state authority more merciful towards the Church. A prominent propaganda agent of the Soviets frankly declares to the Living Church: "Your reforms are stupid and ridiculous in our eyes. What we need is a reform that should, once and for all, throw you and all your reforms out of human consciousness. Nothing less than the complete death-blow to all religion will satisfy us." [17]

"Our aim is not to regenerate, but to destroy every kind of Church, every kind of religion," writes one of the Soviet newspapers: "Moscow for the Workmen" *(Rabotchaya Moskva)*. "The regeneration of the Church, which is being undertaken by the progressive and democratic part of the clergy, is only one of the steps towards the liberation of the working masses in Russia from the yoke of Church authority, of religious narcotics. It is paving the way for us. Therefore we are interested in the victory of the Living Church. But the Old Church, which has been declared to be the 'Dead' Church, is not quite dead yet. We must give it its final death blow." [18] Paul Bertholet, in an article in the *Echo de Paris,* written in 1923 after the arrest of Archbishop Cieplak, quotes the statement of the Bolshevist commissary: "We want to kill all respect for religion in the people. We have already achieved satisfactory results. The Orthodox Church is no more undivided." [19]

Even the upholder of the Living Church, Professor Titlinoff, finishes by expressing his doubts of it being possible for the Living Church to continue working together with Soviet authority. He writes: "There is no inner unity in this friendship; there is no common aim. The Living Church and the Church Regeneration stand on a religious platform, and we cannot imagine that there could be an inner ideological communion with anti-religious socialism. These two Churches still think of rebuilding mankind on a religious basis; a basis which is decidedly denied by socialism. And if once the builders themselves cannot agree of what material the building is to be built

[17] I. Stepanoff, *Thoughts on Religion (Mysly o Religii)*.

[18] Quotation from the booklet of Archbishop Methodius *The Living Church,* p. 84.

[19] *Tz. Vied.,* 1924, No. 9-10, p. 9.

. . . it seems that work in common will be somewhat difficult."[20]

To say "somewhat difficult" is a mild expression. It will be absolutely impossible. Such builders remind us of the builders of the Tower of Babylon, the trouble is not only in regard to the basis, but to the whole building. It is quite impossible to pretend that Christianity can be made to accept without any modifications the principles of communism for social upbuilding. This is what the Living Church is trying to do, declaring that the communists are "establishing the Kingdom of God on earth by political methods." Here we again see the mistake of all Christian hylistic sects. Soviet communism is founded on a doctrine of materialism and it knows nothing higher than material welfare. The equal distribution of wealth is the fundamental aim of every social organization. Therefore authority must not allow anything to hinder it in attaining this aim. The liberty and even the life of millions may be sacrificed for the attainment of this aim. In Christian teaching, on the contrary, the goods of this earth and even life itself are but means of attaining life eternal. Therefore, life on earth must be built up in such a manner that man may express his freedom, strengthen it in the direction of virtue, and thereby render himself more worthy of life eternal. For this aim he must have at his free disposal a certain amount of these material goods; he must be the owner of them. From the Christian standpoint the foundation of the rights of ownership do not at all lie in the satisfaction of material needs only. This is something that man has in common with animals; but man has a regal dignity, for he has been made in the image of God, and this gives him the right to dominate over all created beings (Genesis 1:28; compare 101st Rule of the Sobor of Trullo). Therefore Christianity cannot agree to a social order which is founded on the negation of this right. The aim of the state is, *first of all,* the protection of the right of ownership,

[20] *The New Church,* p. 76.

and only thereafter does it struggle against all misuse of this right. Christianity knows only a voluntary, not a compulsory communism; one that does not go counter to the right of ownership; for never is this right more clearly manifested than when man gives of his own to others. Only he who possesses can give. The fundamental statement of legislation says: *Nemo alteri plus iuriam dare potest quam ipse habet.* This fundamental difference between compulsory and voluntary communism was clearly expressed during the first historical days of the Christian Church. We see it in the instance of Ananias and Sapphira. The Church of the Apostles has given us an example of voluntary communism, *i.e.,* a free denial of the right of ownership for the benefit of the Christian community. Ananias and Sapphira thought that the Christian community demanded compulsory communism and made an attempt to cheat the community. Apostle Peter explained to Ananias his mistake, "Was it not *thine own?* And after it was sold was it not in thine *own power?*" (Acts 5:4). The Lord punished the first Christian heretic-communist with death. But in the course of history this terrible warning did not stop other Christian sectarians from again adopting the tempting scheme of establishing the Kingdom of God on earth by compulsory measures. Soviet communism is nothing but the last link in the long chain of such hylistic sects, with which it is even genetically connected through Marx and Simon.[21]

Compulsory communism has always stood outside the pale of the Church, taking the guise of various hylistic sects, which had cut themselves away from the Church. Voluntary communism within the Church expressed itself in monasticism. The 6th Rule of the Constantinople Council (861) speaks of this.[22]

---

[21] See proofs of this in the fine book of Prof. Fritz Gerlich, *Der Communismus als Lehre vom Tausend-jährigen Reich,* München, 1920. The first and second part of this work are devoted to Russian Soviet Communism (pp. 1-98).

[22] Monks may possess nothing of their own; all that belongs to them must be given over to the monastery; for the Blessed Luke, speaking of those who believe in Christ and are the forerunners *(Scaronoverwi)* of monastic life, says that "nought of the things which he possessed was his own; but they had all things in common" (Acts 4:32); see *Ath. Sintaglit,* II, 667.

In this respect the Living Church has taken up a very determined position. In struggling against monasticism, it is struggling against voluntary communism; for monasticism is, so-to-say, the realization of voluntary communism on the largest scale known to history. Yet, at the same time, the Living Church unconditionally approves of the compulsory communism of Bolshevik authority, which, it assures us, "is establishing the Kingdom of God on earth by state methods." [23]

In this manner the Living Church has forsaken the ground upon which the Church stands, and has accepted a purely sectarian platform. "The Kingdom of God is within you" (St. Luke 17:21), said the Founder of the Church. Therefore it can be implanted only by the mutual working of our own liberty and the Spirit of God; but not by means of "state methods." The Living Church has quite forgotten this. It was seduced by the third temptation of the Great Seducer, who offered Christ as a weapon for His mission "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them" (St. Matt. 4:8-9). Herein the Living Church is similar to the "Holy Roman Inquisition" which thought it could herd men into Paradise with a stick.

We might speak of a schism and of a heresy of the Living Church, if it were not so clear that never in the world's history was there so little cause to be carried away by this illusion. Soviet authority holds the stick very firmly in its own hands, and thinks least of all of the Kingdom of Heaven. The members of the Living Church understand this very well and declare themselves communists only to curry favor with the Soviets. Therefore we are right in accusing them not of heresy, but of fraud and of cheating.

The Living Church has abandoned the high ideals of Christian liberty through greedy class motives. It has been deprived of God's grace, and is showing signs of moral degradation and decay. This is testified to not only by the Orthodox, but by its own leaders and by its friends, the Bolsheviks. The

[23] Resolution of the Sobor of 1923, Acts, p. 7.

"First Priest of All Russia," Krasotin, reports to the plenum of the Synod Assembly (April 16, 1926) that: "Unfortunately we do not see any superiority in the outward behavior of the 'Renovated,' as compared with that of the Old Church members. Many of the Renovated have changed their outward appearance, but inwardly they have not been renovated. In response to petitions of turning over certain temples to the Renovated of Moscow, we have been obliged to listen to such painful replies: 'How can we give over the temples to the Renovated when their pastors give us an example of loose conduct?' " In another place he goes on to say that in the statutes of the Leningrad diocese it has been necessary to provide special measures against wine-drinking and smoking among the clergy of the Living Church.[24]

The resolution passed by the plenum of the Assembly after listening to this report says that: "The Renovated are accused of loose conduct. Often these reproaches are quite justified and deserved. The Assembly forbids such moral looseness." [25] Professor Zarin, member of the Holy Synod, testifies to the same in his article: "The Results of the Plenary Assembly of the Holy Synod." He also points to the lowered moral standard of family life among the members of the Living Church, and admits the necessity of a good "cleansing" of all the "morally-criminal elements." [26]

We see the same situation in the Ukraine. The epistle of the Ukrainian Synod of the Living Church (March 1, 1926) complains that "everyone acts according to his own desires; nobody pays attention to Church authority or accepts the Church canons." The epistle shows its despair "at the shattering of Church discipline, at the self-will, at the looseness of morals, at the disobedience and insubordination to Church authority." [27] Father A. Koreneff says that the clergy of the Synod "halts on both feet"; that it is ideologically unstable, and very easily, at the least pressure from its flock, or on any

---

[24] *Viestnik,* 1926, No. 10, pp. 3-4. [25] *Ibid,* p. 5. [26] *Ibid.,* p. 14.

[27] *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1926, No. 5, p. 1.

other pretext, passes over to the Tikhonian Church, or to the sect of the "Samosviaty," or to that of the Ioanikievtzy;* and that it has no deep conviction regarding the holiness and rightfulness of its own activity.[28]

The leaders of the Living Church are sometimes guilty of the most heinous moral crimes. The family life even of the married bishops of the Living Church is very lax. The petty ambition of these leaders often manifests itself in very comical ways. The *Biezbojnik* quotes the epistle of Patriarch Tikhon (June 28, 1923). Among other things, we read here: "The Renovated are, first of all, eager for profit, honors, rewards. They create new offices and titles; they invent new names for themselves, such as, for instance, 'Metropolitan of All Russia' (Bishop Antonin); 'Archpriest of All Russia' (Krasotin). Their vicar-bishops are given direct the title of Archbishops." [29] The moral decline among the clergy of the Living Church is reflected in their outward appearance, which is very far from what the people have always expected to see in their priests. "He is no priest; he is Max Linder," declare the people regarding the priests of the Living Church (information given by the *Biezbojnik*).[30]

The measures to which the Living Church has recourse to attain its aims merit still greater censure. Titlinoff writes in very lenient language regarding the leaders of the Living Church that they are not very particular as to the means they use to further their own plans and that they do not refuse taking such measures as are contrary to the spirit of brotherly feeling. This, of course, embitters the Church circles.[31] But if

---

* "Samosviaty"—self-saintly; *Ioanikievtzy*—from the name, *Ioanikii*—two well-known sects. (Note of Translator.)

[28] *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1926, No. 19, p. 9.

[29] *Biezbojnik,* 1923, VII, 1, No. 28. We must not forget the title taken by Vvedensky: "The Apostle Messenger of Good Tidings" *(Apostol blagovestnik).* The question of rewards is constantly being discussed in the publications of the Living Church. See, for instance, *Ukrainsky Pravoslavny Blagovistnik,* 1926, No. 1, pp. 6-8.

[30] 1923, VII, 22, No. 31.

[31] *The New Church (Novaya Tzerkoff),* p. 15.

we want to call things by their real names, we must openly declare what these measures are: fraud, calumny, oppression, and execution. The Living Church began its life by fraud, because the permissio of the Patriarch was extorted by fraud; and it was this permissio which the Living Church laid at the basis of its existence. The Living Church grew and strengthened itself through oppression and executions, which it dictated to the godless Soviet Authority.

An ancient Christian apologete said that the Christian Church was erected on the blood of its martyrs.[32] The Living Church was also erected on blood. But this blood was spilt not by its own martyrs, but by the innocent men whose blood it caused to be shed. The Living Church was erected on the blood and sufferings of the martyred clergy, of Metropolitan Benjamin of Petrograd, and of some tens of other bishops, of some thousands of priests, and of many thousand laymen, who have been imprisoned, exiled, and executed for having struggled against the Living Church.[33]

But the blood of others shed by us can never become the cement for the building of a Church, because "it crieth unto Me from the ground" (Genesis 4: 10). An eternal curse lies on such builders, a curse which the gentle Founder of the Church has laid on all those who persecute and shed the blood of those He sent us (St. Matt. 23: 35-38; St. Luke 11: 5). All the blood of the righteous shed on the earth from the blood of the righteous Abel to the blood of the new Russian martyrs will also be laid at the door of these modern bodyguards *(Opritchniki)** disguised in the garb of priests. The prophecy of Christ, "Behold! Your house is left unto you

---

[32] Tertullian, *Apolog.*, Chapter 50.

[33] Many cases of persecution against the Orthodox instigated by the Living Church are published by the *Tz. Vied.*, 1924, No. 19-20, pp. 14-15. The "Letter for the Solovetz Islands" (end of 1926) testifies to the fact that the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchal See and about half (*i.e.*, about 150) of the Orthodox bishops are suffering imprisonment, exile, or have been condemned to compulsory hard labor (*Viestnik* of the R. C. St. M., 1927, No. 7, p. 19).

* *Opritchniki*—the body-guard of John the Terrible; known for its cruelty. (Note of Translator.)

desolate," was fulfilled with marvelous exactitude as regards Jerusalem. It will also, before long, come true as regards the falsely-named Living Church; a Church which was spiritually dead even at the moment of its birth; for it was inspired by no creative idea; for the Spirit of God was not with it.

SUMMARY

WITH the completion of his task, the author desires to repeat that he has made no pretense of making the foregoing pages a literary production. It is hoped that the narrative is sufficiently clear to give the casual reader an idea of the influences which have been acting for and against religion in Russia. Opportunity will then be afforded to study the evidence supporting any conclusion that may challenge the reader's attention.

An effort has been made to show the action and reaction on Religion in Russia of forces both within and without. Religious change began with the revolution of 1917, and was at that time confined largely to the adjustment of the affairs of the Church to the conditions of the twentieth century, and to the new political conditions of Russia. Before the Sobor of 1917-18 had completed its task, the October Revolution had taken place, and the hand of Bolshevism was thrust into the affairs of the Church. Out of this turmoil came a reorganized Church with a Patriarch, Sacred Synod, and Supreme Ecclesiastical Council, replacing the Most Holy Governing Synod of the old régime. Church and State were separated, the office of Procurator abolished, and religious control lodged in a Ministry of Religion.

Metropolitan Tikhon was called to the Patriarchate. Despite Tikhon's desire to render to Caesar the things of Caesar, and to God the things of God, it was impossible to maintain a perfect balance. As long as the Soviet Government was a revolutionary government, the Patriarch remained neutral. Whenever the *de facto* government compromised the honor of the nation, or did violence to the things of God, Tik-

hon was instant in protest. Distrust and hostility were sure to follow. At first the attacks on the Church were in the form of open persecution. When this failed to crush religion, recourse was had to the more adroit and sinister method of weakening the Church by internal discord. A group of ambitious priests, mostly from Petrograd, was encouraged in an effort to promote a schism. The so-called "Living Church" was organized and through intrigue obtained control of the affairs of the Patriarchate. Before proper organization was effected, the "Living Church" in turn experienced two schismatic movements. The Ancient Apostolic Church and the Churchly Regeneration broke from the main body of schismatics. This did not prevent them from working together, even if not in harmony, in an effort to supplant the Patriarchate. Through their machinations, the Patriarch was imprisoned, and the Sobor of 1923 summoned.

The Sobor of 1923 deposed the Patriarch, gave approval to Sovietism in most servile terms, condemned capitalism, and sanctioned a married episcopate and second marriages of priests. No sooner had the reorganized Church created by the Sobor been placed in operation than the Metropolitan Tikhon was released from prison. Then followed a series of conflicts between the Patriarchal Church, acting through the Sacred Synod, and the Reformed Church, acting through a governing body which was called later the Holy Synod. The Patriarch died in 1925. The Metropolitan Peter became his *locum tenens*. Efforts made by the reformed Church to win over the Metropolitan were without success. Metropolitan Peter was then arrested and sent to exile. His successor, Metropolitan Sergius, while repelling overtures from the Reformed group, has been most successful in appeasing the Government. There can be little doubt that the Soviet Government actually fears the power of the Church; and because of this has been willing to become more and more accommodating in its attitude towards the Patriarchate, and places its only hope of advance in its program of "godlessness" in education of youth.

An unfortunate outcome of the Sobor of 1923 was the consecration of John Kedrovsky as the Russian Archbishop of America. Kedrovsky came to America with credentials of the Reformed Church, and a power of attorney entitling him to acquire the property rights of the old Orthodox Church. Unfortunately the Patriarchal party in America was unable to make adequate defense when their claim was presented to court. This resulted in the recognition of Kedrovsky as Archbishop of America, and subsequently of his right to claim the property of most of the Russian churches in America. This decision was given in the City of New York. Thus far, it has been impossible for Kedrovsky to gain a substantial foothold elsewhere. In June, 1928, by decree of the Court of Appeals of the State of New York, the case of Kedrovsky was reopened so far as it affects property rights. Consideration is given in the narrative of the reasons which make Kedrovsky's pretence illegal and uncanonical.

Along with the troubles of the Russian Church at home, confusion has been caused by *émigré* bishops in Europe. This group of bishops has found asylum in Karlowitz, Serbia, where they have organized their own Synod. This Synod has been the center of activities of the Czarist party, which has sought to restore the monarchy in Russia. Responsibility for this has been laid at the doors of the Metropolitan Tikhon and his successors, rendering it necessary for both Patriarch Tikhon and the Metropolitan Sergius to make strong disclaimers, and to condemn the activities of the Synod. The activities of this Synod have recently been transferred to America, bringing additional discord into the life of the confused Russian Church people.

It has been hoped that this series of quotations supporting these facts will serve the author's purpose by promoting the study of the conditions of religion in Russia with a better understanding and deeper sympathy.

W. C. EMHARDT.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Churches

Holy Orthodox Church: The historic Church of Russia continued by the Sobor of 1917-18. Sometimes called the Patriarchal Church.

Living Church: The Church established after the Patriarch was imprisoned, by fraudulent use of permission given to its organizers to arrange the affairs of the Chancery during his imprisonment. This title is also used as the popular name of the Synodal Church growing out of the Sobor of 1923.

Synodal Church: Title assumed by the members of the Sobor of 1923.

Renovated Church (or Renovated): Another name for the Synodal Church.

Churchly Regeneration: A split from the Living Church, headed by Bishop Antonin.

Ancient Apostolic Church: Another split from the Living Church, headed by Archpriest Alexander V. Vedensky.

Councils

Ecumenical Council: A Council of the undivided Church accepted universally. The Eastern Orthodox Church accepts seven such councils.

General Council: A representative Council of the entire body of a branch of the Church. Its decrees are binding on all members of that Communion. Its decisions are binding in matters of polity within that Communion. It may interpret matters of faith, but cannot act in matters of dogma.

Local Council: A council of racial or natural group within any branch of the Catholic Church. Its actions are limited to the sphere of domestic economy. It cannot make any pronouncements on fundamental matters of dogma and polity.

Organizations

Supreme Church Administration: The administrative organization of the Living Church. It is also called Provisional Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration and High Church Administration. Later was renamed Holy Synod.

Centropomgol: Central Committee for Aid of the Starving.

Comsomol: Association of Russian Communistic Youth.
Christomol: Association of Russian Christian Youth.
Supreme Ecclesiastical Council: An Administrative Committee appointed by the Sobor of 1917, to act in connection with the Sacred Synod.
High Church Administration: Same as Supreme Church Administration.

SECTS
Samosviatsky—Self-saintly—a popular sect.
Joanikiertzy—Followers of Joanikii—a popular sect.

SOBOR: A representative Ecclesiastical Council with power of legislation.

SOVIET: Council.

SYNOD
Most Holy Synod: The traditional Russian Synod abolished in 1917.
Sacred Synod: The Synod established by the Sobor of 1917-18.
Holy Synod: The self-styled Synod growing out of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Administration created by the Living Church Sobor of 1923.
Karlowitz Synod: A Synod of refugee bishops living in Karlowitz, Serbia, under the leadership of Antony of Kieff.

NOTES

Absolute uniformity in the spelling of Russian names has been found impossible without taking too much liberty with the individual translations. The use of "v," "f," "ff" to express the same sound seems optional to the translator. Thus we find Kief, Kiev, Kieff. The name Karlowitz is given by some translators as Karlovatz, Karloci, Karlotsky, etc.

It has also seemed unwise to change the Russian method of dating which uses Roman numerals in place of the name of the month, *i.e.,* I January, XI November, etc.

It has also seemed best to leave the quaint expressions of Russian translations unchanged.

ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations will be found in quotations, and especially in the articles of Professor Troitsky:

G. P. U.—General Board of Police Administration.

H. C. A.—Supreme Church Administration (Higher Church Council) (same as V. Z. U.).

R. S. F. S. R.—Russian Soviet Federation of Socialistic Republics.

R. C. St. M.—Russian Christian Student Movement.

U. S. S. R.—Union Soviet of Socialistic Republic.

V. Z. I. K.—All Russian Central Executive Committee.

V. Z. U.—Supreme Church Administration.

Z. I. K.—Central Executive Committee.

PRINTED IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY
MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.